

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

11275

Tell the President if he has any poverty left over from some other place to please send it down here. It's better than us mountain folks has been used to.

And the man lives in the heart of the Appalachian area.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on May 25 I requested unanimous consent to correct a rollcall. I asked that I be recorded as being present and voting "yea" on rollcall No. 104. I was referring to rollcall 105 on final passage of H.R. 8122 authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for which I was present and voted "yea" and not referring to rollcall 104 for which I was not present, having been temporarily and unavoidably called away from the House Chamber.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS AND THE INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. MORSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago I obtained a copy of this evening's Washington Star, and on the front page of the Star are two stories of particular relevance to the remarks that I shall make in a few moments.

The first is a report of a background briefing, attributed to key U.S. officials without further identification, in which they seek to explain the conduct of the United States in the Dominican Republic, and indicate that criticism is unfounded. In the course of this particular report it is stated:

The critics have attacked the American actions on three main grounds: (1) That the OAS should have been consulted and there should have been no unilateral U.S. intervention; (2) there was no need for such a large force as the more than 20,000 marines and paratroopers sent to the Dominican Republic; (3) the intervention was impulsive.

On the same page there appears a report of an interview conducted by Secretary of State Rusk in which he told the news conference "that the question of a standby military force for the OAS would be discussed by a meeting of foreign ministers of the hemisphere which convenes here tomorrow."

I bring these stories to the attention of the House because they have relevance to the remarks I will make.

I would like to go into a little bit of background of this matter. I speak on behalf of some of our colleagues, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from Mary-

land [Mr. MATHIAS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

We have been, as many Americans have been, deeply concerned with the situation in the Dominican Republic, and have conscientiously sought to analyze the situation in a constructive way which might contribute to the national good. As a part of this effort, the statement which we have prepared was taken by myself and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] yesterday, to the Department of State where we gave a top official of the Department an opportunity to review it.

It is highly coincidental that the report which appears in this evening's Star followed so closely on the heels of the meeting of last evening at the Department of State. But I would like to point out clearly that if the anonymous State Department officials were referring to my colleagues and myself in this statement of justification, they missed the mark. First, we have not criticized, nor do we intend to criticize, the administration on any of the grounds set forth in the story in this evening's Star which I quoted for the RECORD. We do not state that the OAS should have been consulted. We do suggest that the OAS should have been informed.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts on this report, and join with him in his remarks. I think the key point he is alluding to here, in the first place, is not criticism of the actions that the administration took in regard to the Dominican Republic, but a criticism of how they were carried out. Specifically he is alluding to the failure, which in my judgment was indefensible, to inform the OAS of the action that the United States was planning to take with regard to the landing of troops in the Dominican Republic.

I would ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he could not comment on information which I believe he has touching on the point of whether or not the U.S. Government informed the OAS before taking action. It is my understanding that our Government did not do so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. In this regard I can only say that our statement that the OAS was not informed before the operation got underway was based on a reliable report by a top official of the U.S. administration.

Mr. REID of New York. Has there been any report that led you to believe there was any substantive reason why we should not or could not have informed the OAS particularly in light of the fact that President Kennedy not only was able to inform the OAS with regard to certain projected actions relative to the Cuban missile crisis but was able to obtain actual agreement? Is there any reason that you know of why we could not at least have picked up the telephone?

Mr. MORSE. In this regard, let me say to the gentleman that an explanation of the failure was made but it did not

seem to me to be a satisfactory explanation. However, I point out to the gentleman that in my view, the two situations are somewhat different—the October 1962 missile crisis and the present Dominican situation. However, I do feel strongly as the gentleman does, that it would have been proper and feasible to have notified the OAS before the troops landed.

The second criticism to which the administration has responded is that there should have been no unilateral U.S. intervention. In this regard, let me make it clear that we do not dispute the necessity of the intervention. We agree that the United States, indeed any nation, would be justified in extending protection to their own citizens who are in danger in foreign uprisings. We also agree that in view of the statements made by the President as to the imminence of a Communist takeover, our action, the action of the United States, was a necessary response.

Third, the administration claims that its critics have attacked American actions on the ground that there was no need for such a large force of more than 20,000 marines and paratroopers in the Dominican Republic. We do not criticize the number of troops. Rather we criticize the failure of the administration properly to explain to the American people and to the world why that number was necessary.

Last, a criticism which is referred to in this article is that the intervention was impulsive. It is not our suggestion that the intervention was impulsive. Quite to the contrary. We indicate that the action was justified and certainly immediate action was essential if the lives of American citizens were to be protected.

So with this background, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the House the thoughts of the five Members, my four colleagues and myself, on the Dominican crisis and more especially on the effect that the Dominican crisis will have on our inter-American system and our relations with our sister Republics in the Western Hemisphere.

I will also discuss what are, I believe, hopefully constructive recommendations which have, in part, been endorsed by the Secretary of State, and the devices whereby the Organization of American States can be strengthened so as to avoid the kinds of situations we are presently experiencing.

The current Caribbean crisis has two vitally important aspects. The first is the search for a stable, progressive, democratic and independent government in the Dominican Republic. This aspect is dramatic and well-publicized.

The second and equally important aspect of the Dominican crisis has been less publicized. It is the impact of the crisis on the Organization of American States and the future of collective security in the hemisphere.

The drama and pace of events in the Dominican Republic must not be allowed to obscure the most vital long-range need of the hemisphere—an international structure within which the growing political and economic strength of the Latin American nations can accrue to the benefit of the hemisphere as

11276

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 26, 1965

a whole. The greatest immediate test of U.S. statesmanship is whether it can prevent preoccupation with the crisis of the present from undermining its commitment to the future of the hemisphere.

The Inter-American Conference of the Organization of American States, which was to have met last week in Rio de Janeiro, and has been postponed, will nonetheless convene in the wake of the Dominican crisis whenever it does meet. That crisis and the part that the United States was required to play in it will inevitably affect the progress in inter-American relations which has been so painstakingly promoted over the past 30 years, unless the administration acts to make a new, lasting and unequivocal commitment to a mutual system of hemispheric defense.

At the Conference, and in preparations for it, the administration will have an excellent opportunity to embrace the concept of an OAS strong enough to remove any reason for future unilateral action in the hemisphere on the part of any American nation. The fundamental principles of the inter-American system demand the true commitment of all to collective security. Never should the OAS be treated as an instrument which any of its members can use or ignore at its own convenience.

The United States and all nations are justified in extending protection to their own citizens endangered in foreign uprisings. The first phase of U.S. operations in the Dominican crisis reflected this just concern.

Neither the United States nor any nation of the Organization of American States can afford the establishment of another Communist dictatorship in this hemisphere—nor can any member of the OAS afford to stand idly by while an effort is made toward that end. Its quick action in the face of potential Communist conquest in the chaos of the Dominican revolt demonstrates that the administration understands this. And even though their position has occasionally been obscured, the Latin American nations also know that the spread of communism cannot be tolerated in this hemisphere. Their votes and their comments in the OAS have reflected a genuine understanding of the need for action in the Dominican crisis.

But on the other hand the administration can help to build the strength of the inter-American system only if it fully appreciates the depth of and the reasons for the equally genuine Latin American concern over recent U.S. actions in the Caribbean. The most valuable asset in hemispheric relations is the capacity to see ourselves as others see us—to view our policy from Latin eyes. From this perspective there are at least five legitimate concerns over U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic or, more particularly, over the implementation of U.S. policy. Each may directly effect the confidence with which Latin governments will greet U.S. professions of support for collective security in the hemisphere.

First. The failure to inform the OAS of U.S. intervention before it was underway was an insensitive oversight. The

administration has repeatedly stressed that time was precious and that it could not afford to wait for an OAS decision. Let it be agreed that this made OAS agreement to the U.S. action impractical before the fact.

Although President Kennedy was able to secure OAS support for the naval quarantine in the 1962 Cuban missile crisis in less than 24 hours, it is clear that the administration could not have waited this long in the current crisis. But at the very least, it could have informed the OAS of its intentions before they were implemented. The OAS could have been told that we were going to send the Marines in, that we would prefer to wait for an OAS decision but time did not allow, and that we hoped that a force authorized by the OAS—which in all likelihood would have included U.S. forces—could assume responsibility at the earliest possible moment.

This course might not have been fully satisfactory either, but it would have provided evidence of our good intentions. The course the administration followed seemed, to many Latin Americans, tantamount to saying to the rest of the hemisphere that we did not really care what they thought.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Would not the gentleman agree there were perhaps two courses of action we could have followed: one, we discussed the importance of informing the OAS of the action we were going to take; and a second possible course in addition to the first would have been to request the OAS to send observers with our forces as they went ashore. This could have been done very promptly.

Mr. MORSE. I think either one of the suggestions of the gentleman would have been a more correct course of action.

The difference between notification and nonnotification may seem subtle to many but it is of paramount importance in maintaining the psychological atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence within which real political and economic progress is possible throughout the hemisphere.

Second. The vast number of U.S. troops used seems disproportionate to the need. The latest reports indicate that there have been 23,000 U.S. troops in Santo Domingo.

Latin Americans understandably tend to equate the contemporary U.S. actions with U.S. intervention in the Caribbean area earlier in the century—intervention broadly resented throughout Latin America. The United States landed sizable contingents of troops in Panama in 1903, in Cuba in 1906, in Mexico in 1914, in Haiti in 1915, in the Dominican Republic in 1916, and in Nicaragua in 1927. On some occasions the troops remained for many years. But there were fewer U.S. forces used in all of these episodes combined than in the current Dominican crisis.

It has not been made clear why a force of this size is necessary. Perhaps the

immediate threat demanded it; perhaps the administration has desired to deter other Castro-backed efforts through a determined demonstration of purpose. Some, but certainly not all, of the 23,000 were required to facilitate the withdrawal of the 4,000 civilians evacuated from the island during the first phase of U.S. operations. In any event, further clarification of the need of a U.S. presence in such numbers is essential. Without a persuasive explanation, Latin American fears will persist. We must always remember that the exercise of North American military strength which serves as a protective shield for the hemisphere may, to Latin Americans, be reminiscent of a paternalism which they had hoped had ended long ago.

Third. The U.S. presentation of the imminent dangers of Communist capture of the Dominican revolution has not been sufficiently documented to gain full and unquestioning support. Latin Americans frequently believe that the United States is unduly anxious to ascribe Communist direction to any popular manifestations of the social and economic revolution in which the entire continent is absorbed. It is vital, therefore, for the United States to document with precision the evidence which proves its case in any instance where it either asks for multilateral action or feels it must act alone in the face of Communist efforts in the hemisphere.

The implementation of administration policy in the Dominican crisis has created questions in Latin America—questions which more careful explanation could have avoided. The suddenness with which the purpose of U.S. intervention was changed from protecting U.S. lives to preventing a Communist takeover inevitably raised some doubts in Latin minds. Identification of 58 Communists in the rebel movement, including some with Cuban training, certainly justifies the need for concern, but it does not serve as proof to skeptical eyes of the need for a massive intervention by the United States.

It is neither necessary nor possible to convince all who doubt U.S. motives or wisdom of the factual basis of our policies. But the public presentation of the case should be made—and it should be full, consistent, and unemotional.

Fourth. U.S. policy has regrettably been accompanied by occasional tendencies toward the patronizing attitude to which the Latin American have become understandably sensitive through the long history of hemispheric relations. Particularly in times of stress U.S. spokesmen must be doubly careful not to use ambiguous language which may lead to misunderstanding.

During the Dominican crisis official U.S. pronouncements have permitted two unfortunate interpretations: First, that because of Latin insufficiencies, only the United States can adequately protect the hemisphere and its peoples; second, that there is something noble about U.S. intervention.

Two examples will suffice. First, when Ambassador Harriman, one of our Nation's most highly respected statesmen, left Santiago, Chile, on May 7 he was reported to have said:

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

11277

President Johnson should never again be put in the position of having to act unilaterally to protect the security of the hemisphere against Communist subversion.

The choice of language was unfortunate because it allowed, by inference, unintended criticism of the Latin Americans—in the sense that they had somehow placed the U.S. President in this unenviable position. What appears to be an effort to fix blame is one of the most common obstacles to agreement when crises occur. In Inter-American relations the result can be disastrous.

On May 3, at the AFL-CIO building, the President nostalgically referred to a favorite quotation of his childhood from the 19th century Massachusetts Senator, George Frisbie Hoar. The passage read:

I have seen the glories of art and architecture, and mountain and river; I have seen the sunset on the Jungfrau, and the full moon rise over Mont Blanc. But the fairest vision on which these eyes ever looked was the flag of my country in a foreign land.

The President, no doubt, meant only to convey his pride in the willingness of U.S. boys to risk their lives in a just cause. But the statement, in the immediate context of the Dominican crisis, may give rise to the fears and fearsome memories of Latin peoples. To them the thought of the U.S. flag in a foreign land is vividly reminiscent of the gunboat diplomacy of U.S. policy in the first part of this century. Today's pride in country has little in common with the less restrained nationalism of a less complicated age, but we must not assume that this is clear to all.

Fifth. The administration has unintentionally encouraged the impression that it has only limited confidence in the OAS, even after the Organization had assumed significant responsibility in the Dominican crisis. After landing its forces the United States encouraged the OAS to act. The OAS did act by sending a special mission to Santo Domingo to work for stability, but subsequent actions may have led many Latin Americans to question the depth of U.S. sincerity in encouraging the OAS to undertake responsibility in the crisis.

First. On May 14, in the U.N. Security Council the United States voted in favor of a U.N. mission to the Dominican Republic. In the eyes of many Latin Americans, including most of the members of the OAS mission, there was no need for a U.N. mission because the OAS had assumed responsibility. A U.S. abstention at the U.N. might have been better evidence of the faith of our Government in the regional defense system of the hemisphere.

Second. On May 16, the United States, without prior consultation with the OAS, sent its own mission to the Dominican Republic to seek stability. While the presence of Messers. Bundy, Mann, Vance, and Vaughn no doubt underscored the determination of the administration in finding a just and lasting settlement of the crisis, it also may have further undermined the effectiveness of the OAS mission.

After the arrival of both the U.N. and U.S. missions, the OAS mission resigned.

The Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations have all sought to strengthen the machinery of the OAS to deal with the subtle but very real threat which Communist subversion presents to the hemisphere. The Dominican crisis, by demonstrating the need for greater speed in the reaction time of the Organization, may in one sense have had a positive effect in this direction. But the implementation of U.S. policy, as described above, may have had the opposite effect by raising serious doubts in Latin America over our sincerity when we plead for a strengthened system of collective security.

We feel confident that the people of the United States will support the administration at the forthcoming Inter-American Conference in its efforts to minimize the long-range effects of the unilateral U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic and to maximize the opportunities to build a stronger Inter-American system.

If the United States is passive and apathetic toward proposals to strengthen the capacity of the OAS to meet threats to hemispheric security through collective action, the Latin American nations may lose all confidence in U.S. intentions. The results would be catastrophic. Every aspect of U.S. relations within the hemisphere would be subject to the most profound suspicion and distrust. Most importantly, the United States might deny itself the opportunity to be identified with the broad social and economic revolution throughout the hemisphere and might no longer have the opportunity to encourage that revolution in directions which conduce toward stable and progressive democracy.

If, on the other hand, the United States welcomes proposals to strengthen the capacity of the OAS to meet threats to the peace of the hemisphere through a system of mutual security, the adverse effects of the Dominican situation may be minimized and the capacity to meet future crises increased. Many Latin Americans construe U.S. policy in the Dominican crisis as a lack of commitment to the multilateral approach to problems in the hemisphere, as a lack of confidence in our Latin American partners. The United States must leave no doubt that its commitment to the multilateral approach is unabated and unqualified. We must embrace the concept of a much-strengthened OAS with the capacity to act, to act swiftly, and to act decisively.

The Inter-American Conference will afford an extraordinary opportunity to do so. In fact, the Conference was originally called at the initiative of Latin Governments to discuss changes to strengthen the OAS in the field of economic matters. The meetings of the OAS Ministers on the Dominican crisis have indicated clearly that the Latin Americans desire to strengthen the Organization so that no nation will feel required to act alone to preserve hemispheric security. In fact, the process of changing the U.S. "presence" in the Do-

minican Republic to an OAS "presence" may be a natural prelude to further institutional steps to strengthen the Organization.

The United States should welcome and support OAS reforms which might include the following:

First. The Foreign Ministers could be required to meet at least annually and not only under crisis conditions. At present they meet in emergencies or in very infrequent Inter-American Conferences. The last regularly scheduled Inter-American Conference was in 1954.

Second. The existing Inter-American Peace Committee could be given expanded authority to act to avoid the use of force between members through the peaceful settlement of disputes. At present this Committee, which operates only to moderate between members in dispute, cannot even do this without the approval of both disputing parties. It might be beneficial to make its operations more flexible by permitting its involvement upon the approval of any single member, by encouraging its involvement in situations where disputes can be anticipated and by providing it a modest operating budget.

Third. A new permanent Security Committee could be created to act with speed and authority in any instance where elements external to the hemisphere, a dispute between members, or events within any member's territory directly jeopardize the security of the hemisphere. The existing Peace Committee serves only to encourage the peaceful settlement of disputes between two members. There should also be a permanent committee which represents the OAS foreign ministers, and which, working in conjunction with the Secretary General, can claim jurisdiction in any crisis which threatens the security of the hemisphere. It could act in advance of a full meeting of the Foreign Ministers and subsequently could supervise the execution of their decisions. Such a committee might have obviated the U.S. conclusion that the OAS could not have acted with sufficient speed to prevent a calamity in the Dominican Republic.

Fourth. The Secretariat of the OAS could be greatly strengthened in authority and function, including the right of the Secretary General to help initiate limited action in the peacekeeping field in advance of a meeting of Foreign Ministers. At present the powers of the Secretary General and the Secretariat are extremely limited. The requirement for speed, which was so evident in the Dominican crisis, suggests greater authority for the permanent staff to act in conjunction with a new Security Committee in anticipation of early approval by the Foreign Ministers. Obviously the office and person of the Secretary General must retain the full confidence of each member that his actions will be in the interest of all.

Fifth. A small, permanent OAS peace-keeping force could be created for use in disputes between members or, even more importantly, in cases where elements alien to the hemisphere threaten the

11278

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 26, 1965

security of any member. Such a force would have been ideal in the Dominican crisis; and an OAS force formed to replace U.S. troops in Santo Domingo can be a natural predecessor to a permanent force. The force would best be fully internationalized and on a standby basis under OAS command. The force would be under the ultimate command of the OAS Foreign Ministers, but the Secretary General and a new Security Committee, under the revised structure described above, might be given the authority to order its limited use where time was of the essence and the Foreign Ministers had not had the opportunity to meet.

Sixth. Long-range OAS reform could reflect a separation of economic and political issues. A plethora of bureaucratic institutions serves no useful purpose, but the artificial centralization of vastly complex and essentially distinct programs may work to the disadvantage of each. The present highly centralized OAS structure may not distinguish adequately between political and economic concerns. Many Latin Americans advocate separate and major OAS structures for each, and the United States should welcome moves in that direction. If a decentralization of OAS functions were to come about it might be possible and desirable to take the centers of OAS economic and social activities out of Washington and establish the appropriate institutions in Latin America itself.

Not all, and perhaps none, of these major changes can be fully explored and given effect at the Inter-American Conference. But the hemisphere has a new opportunity to make a new commitment to the principles of mutual security and multilateral action. For the United States the opportunity is a necessity because it has risked not only its prestige but the hemisphere's capacity for collective security through its necessary response to recent actions in the Caribbean.

The long-term interests, as well as the short-term interests, of the United States favor a new national commitment to a strengthened OAS. The relations within the Western Hemisphere in the next two decades will provide a continuing test of the capacity of the United States to lead Nations in the throes of social and economic revolution in the preservation of their freedom. The challenge facing this country is whether we are prepared to welcome the growing independence and political maturity of the developing Latin Nations as a new source of strength within the Western World.

The United States cannot shut its eyes to reality and to the future as well. It must encourage change and the progress of others.

It must recognize that a vital and thriving and strong Latin America is an impetus to an even more vital and thriving and strong hemisphere. If we choose to embrace the future we will seek hemispheric institutions which reflect the potential strength of the Latin Nations. We must encourage the day when mutual hemispheric security provides precisely

that. To hasten that day, we must seek common policies on common problems through dedication to the common cause of all who cherish freedom.

Mr. HILLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I heartily concur in what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said and want to associate myself with his very constructive and responsible remarks in this critical area of our national life and of the life of the international community, particularly the life of the Western Hemisphere, and compliment the gentleman for the really outstanding job which he has done in bringing these matters and problems and positive suggestions to the attention of the House.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

NEGRO VIOLENCE AGAINST WHITES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in last Sunday's Washington Post there were three stories printed under a single heading, all dealing with incidents in which mobs of Negroes, armed with switchblade knives, nail-studded boards and rocks, attacked whites in widely scattered areas of the Nation. One of these attacks was upon a policeman while he was performing his duty.

I have waited patiently for someone to take the floor and urge Federal marshals be sent to New York and Milwaukee and New Orleans to protect these victims of mob rule. But those who shed crocodile tears over the violence stirred up by outside agitators in Alabama and Mississippi are strangely quiet now that the shoe is on the other foot.

I have waited patiently, too, for those Members, particularly in the other body, who have been so vocal in their cry for larger and larger sums for larger and larger police forces to repel some of these attacks. None of them have, as far as I know, deplored the manhandling of this policeman in New York mentioned in the first story. It causes one to wonder what the purpose of higher police budgets is, if, at the same time, these mobs are encouraged to take to the streets and obey only those laws that suit their whim and fancy.

The professional agitators in CORE, the NACP, SNIC, and SCLC and others have predicted another long, hot summer of their racial violence. If these three stories are harbingers of what is to come, I will sincerely regret it but I will be, at the same time, glad these pigeons are not coming home to roost because of any action I have taken.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the three stories I have mentioned.

MOB ATTACKS POLICEMAN, FREES ARRESTED NEGRO

NEW YORK, May 22.—A chanting, shouting mob of 200 Negroes surrounded and attacked

a white policeman in the Bronx last night and released a Negro prisoner the policeman had apprehended. A white grocer who tried to help the policeman was stabbed in the back and critically wounded.

Four persons were arrested as a result of the assault and later attacks on other policemen and detectives stemming from the incident.

The mob surrounded Patrolman Philip Siegel, 43, and hit him with a pop bottle before his prisoner fled from the scene.

Later, two detectives and a patrolman, seeking witnesses, were attacked by two men and a woman, who were arrested.

The trouble started when Siegel spotted two Negroes breaking the window of a shop and caught one of them after a chase.

He took the youth back to the furniture store and telephoned police station for a patrol car.

Soon the mob milled around Siegel and began chanting, "Let him go."

When the policeman tried to put handcuffs on the suspect, he was struck from behind and shoved to the ground. The suspect started to run. Siegel drew his gun, fired a warning shot in the air and again caught the suspect.

Once again the mob closed in on Siegel and chanted, "Why did you shoot?" and "Let him go."

One of the mob, armed with a soda pop bottle, stepped forward and told Siegel, "We're going to take him away from you."

He hit Siegel on the hand with the bottle and the prisoner broke free and fled.

Siegel, his gun pointed at the mob, was backing away when he heard a voice behind his saying, "All right, officer, I'm with you."

"I didn't turn because I wanted to keep facing the crowd," Siegel said.

He explained that the voice was that of the grocer, Enrique Negron.

As police reinforcements arrived on the scene, the mob scattered and Negron was found sprawled on the sidewalk with a stab wound.

Edward Collins, 18, whom the policeman identified as one of his attackers, was among the arrested, charged with felonious assault.

MILWAUKEE

At least 50 persons looked on without helping as youths armed with a switchblade knife, a nail-studded board, and a chunk of concrete beat three motorcyclists Friday night, police reported yesterday.

Samuel Hicks, 43, suffered a broken jaw and was knocked unconscious during the attack. Donald Peterson, 29, was cut and bruised and his wife, Margaret, 23, was also bruised.

The victims are white. They said the four teenage boys who attacked them were Negro.

NEW ORLEANS

A fist fight between a group of young whites and Negroes at a bus stop in New Orleans early yesterday resulted in the fatal stabbing of one of the white men.

Frederick Riehm, 21, New Orleans, died in a hospital a short time after being stabbed in the chest.

The white teenagers said they were in a car with Riehm and drove past a bus stop where six young Negroes were standing when, they said, one of the Negroes threw a rock through the car's rear window. They got out of the car and the fight followed.

(Mr. BERRY (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

May 26, 1965

color. It is a matter of going into court and having these statutes enforced.

Fenet, the French statesman, in making a report for the revision of the law of France and the adoption of a civil code, and having in mind the failure of the French Revolution in its effort to take leave of past thought and achievement and to set up a new social and governmental system based upon supposedly new ideas, gave expression to a maximum which should not be forgotten. It recites:

It is better to preserve what it is not necessary to destroy.

I ask you to think of this maxim for a moment—

It is better to preserve what it is not necessary to destroy.

For this is the basic proposition that must be resolved in your minds and in your hearts before a vote is cast on the proposal before us. It is better to preserve the freedoms and the liberties the Constitution guarantees us, as long as it is not necessary to destroy it.

It is an endless process, Mr. President, to preserve liberty.

Liberty cannot be forced by the bayonet nor granted by the rash act of a legislature. True liberty is gained through the orderly process and can only be preserved by it. This has always been and always will be.

The overriding issue at stake here is whether we are going to uphold the orderly process, or whether we are going to succumb to those who teach civil disobedience and call for demonstrations and street scenes to provide it.

The question is whether we are going to take the low, dangerous road of appeasement and expediency, or the high road of reason and orderly process.

The question is whether we are going to continue to live by the Constitution, or whether we are going to abandon it to meet the demands of the hour.

The question is simply whether we are going to nullify and amend the Constitution by statute, or whether we are going to adhere to the provisions of it that provide the orderly way for change.

And this is the question, Mr. President, that each of us must answer before we cast our vote on S. 1564. For this legislation, by its enactment, would nullify and repudiate vital provisions of the Constitution and destroy many of our legal institutions.

The Constitution of the United States has often been called "a divinely inspired creation." I think the hour is here for us to pause and rededicate ourselves to it and to "pledge our lives, our fortunes, and sacred honor" to preserve it. And in the solemn moment that we do, we take renewed meaning of the wisdom and warning expressed in that immortal Farewell Address in 1796:

Should a modification of the Constitution be necessary it should be made by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation.

Mr. President, the United States is a constitutional system of government.

It was by the Constitution that it took life.

It has been by the Constitution that it has survived.

It will be by abuse of the Constitution that it dies.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

A Nevadan wrote those words nearly 100 years ago. They became the 15th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Nevada was the first State to ratify this amendment, and it has been a part of the Constitution since 1870. Yet today these historic words are the focal point of one of the major issues before Congress—and before the people.

Without question this amendment has not only been ignored but brazenly abused in some areas of our Nation. Its basic guarantees have been willfully denied to the Negro of the South and to other racial groups elsewhere. Efforts to correct this flagrant wrong in State and Federal courts and at local government levels have failed. Now Congress has turned at last to the second paragraph of the 15th amendment: "The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Our duty is clear. We in Congress must take every necessary step to guarantee the right to vote to every American equally. This is why the voting rights legislation proposed by the President and now before the Senate will be enacted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] on his own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me at this time.

PROBLEMS OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to a column that was published last evening in The Evening Star. Since the subject is not germane, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed to speak on the question at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. The column by Mr. Charles Bartlett is entitled "Problems in 'Casting' Dominicans." The burden of Mr. Bartlett's article is that many of the reports of the crisis in Santo Domingo have stemmed from efforts on the part of some making those reports to pick out the "good guys" and the "bad guys" and contrast them with one another, when,

as Mr. Bartlett aptly points out, neither are all good or all bad, and one is not clearly distinguishable from another.

It is in the pattern of that complexity that the American people have been asked to formulate their judgments in regard to what is transpiring in the Caribbean. In the conclusion of his column, Mr. Bartlett writes—

Preconceptions of American clumsiness in Latin affairs persist from the days before 1958 when few of the problems and realities had been recognized. The crisis in Vietnam has encouraged an hypothesis that reporters may be more perceptive than the officials on the scene.

But the lesson of Fidel Castro, on whom many of us erred, was that the United States cannot afford to be mistaken on the nature of the men who seize power in neighboring republics. This lesson should inspire deep patience with the President's wariness in forming a coalition to govern this puverized country.

Mr. President, there are those of us who can criticize and freely criticize. We ought always to be able to do so in this country, and we can even criticize with the luxury of not being responsible for our criticisms. We can criticize with sincerity, and if we are wrong, there is no major disastrous consequence.

But the President of the United States and those directly responsible to him cannot enjoy that luxury. They must be right, if possible, the first time. That is the essential difference between critics and those who carry the frightful burden of decisionmaking both in the Dominican Republic and in Vietnam, as they seek the wisest possible courses of action that will survive the tests of the future and the reflections of hindsight.

Therefore, I would hope that we could do a great deal more than we have been doing until now to get before the people of our country the real complexities and the contradictions and the befuddlements of the many overlapping and intertwined issues in both of those areas of the world in order better to understand the need for the kinds of decisions that we ultimately make.

The attitude, all too prevalent, that any person who runs casually through those torn countries can make a better judgment and a better decision than someone whose neck is really on the block and who has to bear the consequences of the decision, is one of the failings that we find in our midst at this time. I should like to believe that we could find a way to correct some of the misstatements that have been made or some of the partial statements that are being made at this time.

I have encouraged the Secretary of State to consider accepting questions in a more public way than he has until now from whomever he designates, or whatever segment of our critics would seem appropriate, and to respond to those questions in a better way, more than merely in print—preferably in one of the communications media of the air, on radio, TV, or both—in order that the difficulties involved can be eliminated and the separation of fact from fiction can likewise be more accurately made. Such a course would contribute a great bit in the sense of public information,

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11311

future demagogues on any issue whatever who, through manipulation of mass emotion and hysteria, force the enactment of measures which similarly flaunt our basic constitutional provisions? What then will happen to our constitutional rights—to the Constitution itself—and what then will be the course toward which our Government and our country will be directed?

These are the questions that I ask each and every one of us to seriously and conscientiously ponder. I ask Senators this as an American. I ask Senators this in appreciation of those before and in concern for those ahead. I ask Senators to take a long look at the road ahead and see where all of this may lead us. I would remind the Senate that delay is preferable to error. The easy course today may be appeasement and even surrender to the emotional demands for legislation which clearly repudiates the Constitution; but may I say that we do this at an exorbitant and dangerous cost to the generations of Americans who will come after us and we breach a trust to those who came before us—who gave us our constitutional system—and to those who have given their lives to preserve it. For, when we leave a system of government of laws for a government of men in response to the clamor and expediency of the day, we give open invitation to the dangers and possible destruction of which we have been warned.

Two thousand years before the Virginia Convention of 1788, where this abiding truth was to be more eloquently expressed, Aristotle warned of the dangers that arise when a government of laws is corrupted by a government of men. In his "Politics," Aristotle praises the rule of the law and says this:

Therefore, he who bids the law rule may be deemed to bid God and reason alone rule, but he who bids man rule adds an element of the beast; for desire is a wild beast, and passion perverts the minds of rulers, even when they are the best of men. The law is reason unaffected by desire.

The law is reason unaffected by desire, Aristotle declared—unaffected by mass hysteria and emotion, by demonstrations and sit-ins, by political thirst and political power and, above all, by expediency.

Mr. President, every Member of the Senate knows, regardless of his personal feelings on the subject, that the Constitution clearly reserves to the States the authority to establish qualifications for voting. This authority is expressly provided in article I, section 2, and confirmed in the 10th and 17th amendments of the Constitution. Under this reserved power the States have for 175 years determined the rules and requirements for voting by their citizens. But now in this bill the Federal Government proposes to usurp this authority and take over the function of establishing voter qualifications. If Congress can so blatantly ignore and nullify a specific, unqualified provision of the Constitution in this instance, what other parts of the Constitution can ever again be regarded as inviolate?

Not only would this bill usurp the constitutional powers of the States, but

it would do it under a formula designed so that only certain selected States will be brought within its application, and other States excluded. The Attorney General of the United States admits this. He admits that while the bill is supposed to be a bill for the entire United States, it just so happens that the standards set forth in the formula of the bill apply only to a few States. The Attorney General admits that it just so happens that these States are, as he put it in his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, a part of the "old Confederacy." I submit, Mr. President, that these are indeed weird standards by those who are supposed to represent all of the people of the United States, and the Attorney General's own testimony puts us on guard as to the real purpose and meaning of the bill before us.

The bill would give one Federal official, the Attorney General, the power of decision in regard to which States may or may not enforce their existing voter qualification laws, and which are to be taken over by Federal registrars. The bill would prevent any State seeking relief from arbitrary enforcement action by a Federal officer from going into any U.S. court, other than the District Court for the District of Columbia. This unprecedented restriction is an insult to the integrity of the Federal judges in the Southern States, and impugns the honor of the entire Federal judicial system. The bill would by legislative fiat determine and declare that the right to vote is being denied in four States because they collect a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. It would provide that if the constitutionality of poll taxes is sustained by the courts, the Congress shall then be empowered to override the court's decisions and regulate the payment of poll taxes in the four States involved. Provision by provision, the bill goes on in the same harsh, punitive and discriminatory way.

I may say, Mr. President, that in my last speech on the bill I discussed the matter of the poll tax. What an inconsequential, vanishing phenomenon it is today. As I said, in my State of Alabama the poll tax is \$1.50. We cannot go back for more than 1 year in the collection of it. The maximum, therefore, is \$3. Every cent of the dollar and a half goes to the public schools for the education of the youth of the State of Alabama.

The bill is entitled "A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes."

The truth is, Mr. President, that S. 1564 was not drafted with the idea of dealing with a constitutional problem. I contend it was drafted primarily for "other purposes," that is, to satisfy the mass demonstrations blocking our streets and highways, and to stop the invasion of public buildings with sit-ins and sit-ins. The bill pretends to be "appropriate legislation" to prevent the voting rights of citizens of the United States from being denied or abridged by States on account of race or color. It pretends that under the 15th amendment Con-

gress has the power to fix and regulate voting qualifications in the individual States. It pretends to justify any action by the Congress on the basis of the appropriate legislation clause of the 15th amendment.

In fact, Mr. President, S. 1564 can pretend no such thing. History shows that the 15th amendment does not justify any such contention that Congress has any such power under the 15th amendment. The history of the 15th amendment and the debates and the proceedings in Congress at the time it was adopted make clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that the proponents and sponsors of the amendment had no intention of giving Congress the authority to fix and regulate voting qualifications in the individual States. The 15th amendment simply declares that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged," by either State or Nation, "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude," and it gives Congress the power to enforce this provision for impartial suffrage by "appropriate legislation." There is an assumption only of the potential right to vote. There is no assumption of a vested right to vote. The potential right to vote can become actual only by a law of the State, or in a territory by a law of Congress. There is no mandate that the actual right shall be conferred in either case. The only mandate is that, in conferring it, the grant must be impartial among all citizens. The plain import of the amendment, therefore, is that when the right to vote is granted, it must be impartially granted; but it is always competent to the State to declare that "when."

As we see, Mr. President, it is abundantly clear that the 15th amendment was not intended to give Congress the power to strike down State literacy tests, to set voter qualifications, or to regulate State poll taxes. A long line of Supreme Court decisions have confirmed that the power to set voter qualifications, by the language of the Constitution, rests with the States and confirm that neither the 14th nor the 15th amendment gave the Congress the power to change this by legislative fiat.

The proponents of S. 1564, however, argue that in some States, literacy tests and other means are used to exclude Negroes from voting in violation of the 15th amendment and, therefore, that this legislation is necessary to protect certain constitutional rights. They argue then that we must destroy the Constitution in order to preserve it.

I contend again, however, that there is a lawful and orderly way to accomplish any desired result through amendment to the Constitution in accordance with the procedures outlined in article V. I contend again that it is not necessary to destroy the Constitution or any provision of it in order to preserve it, and that if it is, a requiem at this time would be more appropriate than a vote at this time.

In one of my last speeches on the bill I cited not one, not two, not three, not four, not five, but a number of cases which guarantee that a person shall have the right to vote regardless of race or

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11313

and thus public understanding, of what is transpiring in both of those areas.

I am firmly convinced, after pursuing the subject as closely as one can from this position, that the President has followed the problem with extremely great patience and insight, and that our policies are beginning to show their real substance and strength. But it will require a little more time than some of the quick reactions that we have been reading about or are being told about would allow for. So I call special attention of the Members of this body to the column by Mr. Bartlett in the Evening Star of yesterday, and I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed intact following my informal remarks.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star
May 25, 1965]

PROBLEMS IN "CASTING" DOMINICANS
(By Charles Bartlett)

The roots of the discord between the Johnson administration and segments of the press over the crisis in the Dominican Republic are tangled and deep.

The Government officials in charge of the Dominican nettle do not cloak their anger and dismay at the tendency of some important reporters in Santo Domingo to portray the United States as the suspicious party, the rebels as the heroes, and the junta leaders as the villains in the messy situation.

The anger is goaded by instances in which these reporters appeared to be stretching isolated instances to support a contention that U.S. policy is aimed in fact at crushing the rebels and installing rightwing authority.

This is a shortcut that some have urged and that President Johnson has doggedly resisted. It is the answer that is no answer but it attracted those whose concern with the larger consequences was dwarfed by the drama on the scene.

This outlook infected many Americans in Santo Domingo, particularly those who had watched American boys fall to snipers. One wrote last week, "If the fools who sit and deliberate what must be done and how wicked intervention is could see their own blood spilling out, they might decide that drastic action is necessary."

Johnson's need to avoid the trap of this emotionalism led him to supplant the diplomats on the scene with John Bartlow Martin and to direct Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to put the U.S. forces under a general "who didn't wear his stars too heavily." The President has reflected an awareness throughout the crisis that he must justify his intervention by installing a broad-based government.

His show of support for Gen. Antonio Imbert Barrera was criticized as a move to impose a strong man. Some insist that he was only diverted from this course by the flurry of press criticism. Imbert performed the useful function of replacing Gen. Wessin y Wessin, and some, including Martin and the papal nuncio, believed he might become a rallying point. When this possibility faded, the President dispatched the Bundy-Vance mission.

In covering these developments and the subsequent moves to establish a coalition weighted toward the rebels, the reporters who flew into Santo Domingo were seriously handicapped. They were largely strangers to the incredibly complex Dominican scene and they could not be kept closely informed on the delicate maneuverings that were underway.

The most insidious myth that confronted them was the idea that the contenders could be divided into good and bad men. All the major figures on both sides have been badly warped by the long dictatorship and they defied any ready classification.

Juan Bosch had the opportunity, for example, to become a heroic figure by asserting his leadership in the chaos created by his followers. But his courage failed him and he remained in Puerto Rico. He must now defend his self-respect by denouncing the United States.

Rafael Fernandez, a Bosch favorite whose death last Wednesday added new bitterness to the crisis, will almost certainly become a martyr. He was a promising and popular individual. But curiously he served as deputy director in the Trujillos' secret police in the period after the dictator's assassination when these police was imposing brutal revenge in many quarters. Later assigned to the Dominican Embassy in Spain, he became involved with a Communist cell. It is difficult to gage such men.

Preconceptions of American clumsiness in Latin affairs persist from the days before 1958 when few of the problems and realities had been recognized. The crisis in Vietnam has encouraged an hypothesis that reporters may be more perceptive than the officials on the scene.

But the lesson of Fidel Castro, on whom many of us erred, was that the United States cannot afford to be mistaken on the nature of the men who seize power in neighboring republics. This lesson should inspire deep patience with the President's wariness in forming a coalition to govern this pulverized country.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

I believe it is a fair summary to say that instead of devoting a little time to the application and enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which fully covers many fields, including voting rights, the pending bill was put together hurriedly, without caution, because of the pressure of the marchers. It is a bill that was introduced as a matter of political expediency. It has had that tone and tenor all the way through.

Another aspect of the matter relates to the far-reaching provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which was a revolutionary act. There has not been enough time since its passage for people in many areas of the country to adjust to it and for the rank and file leadership at the various political levels of government really to understand how it applies to them, what their duties are, and what they can do as a practical matter to stand behind the law of the land. Whether the people like the law or not, almost everyone is willing to abide by it.

It is a double tragedy that even though we already have that law, and this rush order, as I have already mentioned, has been given to meet the marchers' demands, even without allowing time to ap-

ply the law, the actual provisions of the proposed law invade some of the most sacred and most important and essential parts of the Constitution of the United States.

I come quickly to the part that I believe is most vital; that is, the part that invades the provisions of the Constitution with reference to voter qualifications. The bill provides for a downgrading and a degrading of voter qualifications; an outlawing of some of the most vital and essential parts of voter qualifications, including one on which there should not be any real difference of opinion; that is, a simple literacy test.

I am impressed by the fact that the Senate in 1 week passed a bill with reference to extending the educational processes in the Nation, even in the elementary schools, and only a few weeks later, by a meat-ax method, is considering a bill to abolish literacy tests in large areas of the country, even to the extent of the ability to read and write.

I have also noticed in all that has been said, from the White House, from the Attorney General's office, from the floor of the Senate by the proponents of the measure, and in the press, that nothing has been said about the responsibilities of citizenship with respect to voting. That has not been emphasized. Everything that is emphasized relates to rights—so-called rights. Nothing is said about obligations. Everything is said about rights; nothing is said about responsibilities.

Nothing has been said to the people about self-improvement in matters of citizenship. Nothing has been said about the lessons to be learned from self-denial in order to improve oneself as a citizen. Nothing has been said about the underlying principles of self-control and self-improvement.

I believe in citizens voting and exercising their basic privileges. But I believe that in order to protect those persons, there must be some kind of regulation, some kind of control, some kind of qualifications established to regulate the voting privilege. It is not a right; it is a privilege. In one of his writings on self-government, the great Woodrow Wilson, a man of strong moral courage and intellectual capacity, and having a spiritual reservoir that lent strength and judgment to his every act, said:

Self-government is not a mere form of institutions, to be had when desired if only proper pains be taken. It is a form of character. It follows upon the long discipline which gives a people * * * the habit of order and peace and common counsel and a reverence for law which will not fail when they themselves become the makers of law.

Any comment by me upon those marvelous words of wisdom from the pen of that truly great man would be superfluous. I shall only say that he summed up in those words the meaning of self-government. It depends upon a form of character that results from processes of self-denial. That should be the watchword today, rather than the general idea that everyone's salary will be increased, everyone's welfare payments will be increased, and that poverty will

11314

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 26, 1965

be abolished without any attempt at self-help.

The abolishment of qualifications for electors, of literacy tests, and of other requirements that I have mentioned is a myth. It is a myth that will lead us down the road to self-destruction.

The worst feature of the bill is that it undertakes to suspend the Constitution. It does not meet head-on the contention that the qualifications of voters must be valid; that the literacy tests are valid. The courts have recognized their validity. A former Attorney General can be quoted to that effect, and so, I think, can the present Attorney General. The bill does not meet that proposition head-on but seeks to suspend the Constitution of the United States. Under the guise of enforcing one provision, the bill proposes to suspend the Constitution in other particulars. One provision of the Constitution cannot be suspended on the ground of enforcing another. The bill sets the most dangerous of precedents for the future by providing that the Constitution, including the 15th amendment, can be enforced by letting Congress write the remedy. I verily believe we have already written that remedy by the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The operation of the remedy must be through the judicial processes, through the courts. The courts must be kept open. The pending bill literally would close the doors of the courts to a large segment of the citizenry of our country. It is essential that in a republican form of government the courts remain open to the people. We propose, in effect, to close even the Federal court with the exception of this small avenue of remedy which would be available in the courts of the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia is more than 1,000 miles from the place where the litigation may arise.

I believe that it is absolutely essential to due process of law that the courts remain open. The due process of law, mentioned in the 14th amendment, is essential in a republican form of government. The courts must be kept open to the litigants, to the people, and to the Government.

It is essential in a republican form of government that, under due process of law, the legislative processes of the various States be kept open. The pending measure would literally close the door on the State legislatures which might be affected by the application of the bill.

It is unthinkable. It is unheard of. I do not believe that it would be tolerated here for 10 minutes on any subject except on a voting rights bill.

The pending measure demonstrates the sadness of the situation that we have got into in our country. It illustrates what can happen when there is an emotional wave engendered by the marchers and the groups with political demands of expediency, even before there was an opportunity for the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to begin operation.

Perhaps I am too strict in my interpretation of the Constitution. I do not believe that I am. However, one of the minor atrocities of the pending bill is that, sailing along here under the guise of enforcing the 15th amendment, we

launched out into a wholly different territory and agreee to what I call the New York State amendment. On the other hand, we propose to go into a State in which there is no charge of any kind of racial discrimination and dip down into the net very deeply, to check the qualifications they have established for citizens to register and vote and their literacy tests. In the pending measure, we undertake to overrule the great State of New York on an extraneous matter to this bill, on a subject that is irrelevant to the 15th amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. President, only by the broadest stretch of the imagination could the matter be related to any part of the Constitution as it pertains to voting rights. If the amendment pertaining to the State of New York were to be upheld, it would mean that the Constitution would be gone and that there would no longer be any provision of the Constitution relative to voting qualifications that would have any meaning whatsoever.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I believe there is an error there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend, the Chair will check the time.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair. I thought I had 32 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator used 28 minutes of his time on yesterday and 15 minutes today, which leaves exactly 17 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair very much.

Mr. President, for the second consecutive year the Senate has seen fit to invoke cloture on a measure which presents grave and far-reaching constitutional issues. The debate limitation thus imposed will prevent full and adequate consideration of the proposal now before the Senate, even though that proposal reflects a philosophy foreign to many traditional concepts of constitutional government in this Nation. I believe that S. 1564 is unreasonable, unwise, and unnecessary legislation. However, even if one assumes that the purposes of S. 1564 may be worthy, the means adapted thereby of securing those purposes are not only beyond the power granted the Federal Government but are directly contrary to a number of our most treasured constitutional principles.

One of the truly great constitutional authorities in the history of our Nation, the late Dr. Edwin S. Corwin, who edited the fifth edition of "The Constitution of the United States of America"—U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958—stated in the Introduction to that publication that the effectiveness of Constitutional law as a system of restraints on governmental action in the United States depends on four doctrines which he listed as:

- (1) The doctrine or concept of federalism;
- (2) the doctrine of the separation of powers;
- (3) the concept of a government of laws and not of men, as opposed especially to

indefinite conceptions of presidential power; (4) and the no longer prevalent substantive doctrine of due process of law and attendant conceptions of liberty.

An examination and analysis of S. 1564 reveals that it clearly violates each of these doctrines, which Mr. Corwin stated will determine the effectiveness of constitutional law as a restraint on Government action. Because the passage of S. 1564 by Congress will constitute a rejection of these doctrines, what we now decide will have implications far beyond the matter of securing the right to vote. For if Congress can ignore basic constitutional principles for one reason, it can likewise ignore these principles for any reason it desires. Acceptance of such a philosophy by Congress, if upheld by the courts, would mean that there are no longer any restraints on governmental action; the respective States would be reduced to mere administrative units, and the rights of citizens would no longer be inviolate against governmental interference.

The doctrine of federalism, as known in the United States, presupposes the existence of a central government, composed of autonomous political entities, or "States," which have joined together for common purposes. The Central Government is delegated such powers as the States may determine necessary, and the remaining powers, or residual powers, continue to be vested in the States. Within the realm of these delegated and reserved powers, each government is sovereign; the powers of one may not be assumed or denied by the other. The authority of the Central Government is supreme, of course, in areas of common jurisdiction, but there is no Federal supremacy in the absence of authority specifically delegated to the Federal Government.

This is the plan of government set forth in the Constitution of the United States, with the powers of the Central Government clearly defined.

The proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965, now pending in the Senate, violates and casts asunder the doctrine of federalism. Although the Constitution clearly and without question provides that the respective States have the sole and exclusive jurisdiction to establish voter qualifications, both for the Federal and State elections, S. 1564 would deny to certain States the power to exercise this constitutional authority.

The specific provisions of the Constitution dealing with this power are so unequivocal, and the Supreme Court interpretations thereof so explicit, that it would hardly seem necessary to consider them. Indeed, even the proponents of S. 1564 acknowledge the exclusive jurisdiction of the States in this field, but nevertheless advance the argument that the Congress has the power to "suspend" the exercise of that power under the guise of enforcing the 15th amendment. Granted that the Federal Government is delegated certain authority under that amendment to prohibit the denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of race or color, that provision of the Constitution cannot be given a favored position to the extent of abro-

11422

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 26, 1965

called, murdered with your money, by your representatives.

Last year, cotton brought Texas farmers \$650 million—a sum that economists say is multiplied several times as the lint and fiber flow through the economic life of this State. U.S. farmers received \$2.5 billion for the versatile fiber and its equally useful seed. This does not sound like a crop on its deathbed, does it?

But that revenue represented a drop of \$111 million in Texas farm income, a decrease of \$237 million for the United States. And each year more of the dwindling revenue comes out of the Federal Treasury, while fewer farmers grow fewer acres of cotton.

Furthermore, Representative HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, has just introduced a bill that would cut the minimum acreage of cotton by 2 million acres—about one eighth. This has other provisions that immediately caused outraged protests from many in the cotton industry, although it has some features that would improve the present cotton legislation. On the whole, the Cooley proposal is geared to the same philosophy that has created the present cotton crisis, in the opinion of most Dallas authorities who have analyzed it.

Representative Cooley's bill may be no more than a trial balloon. Surely, say cotton men, Congress will not enact such a monstrosity. But almost everything Congress has been doing for 30 years has headed toward destruction of the American cotton industry and has aided its competitors—foreign growers and makers of manmade fibers everywhere. And, unfortunately, the cotton industry has been a house divided on legislative matters, and still is.

Significantly, and almost simultaneously with the Cooley action, the world's greatest cotton firm has further reduced its cotton operations. Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, a multimillion-dollar corporation that has been a leader in enlightened enterprise and service to the grower and user of cotton, has announced a series of reductions in offices and personnel.

There can be but two reasons for this. The first is the Federal program of curtailing cotton. The second is the Federal system of financing cooperatives—of giving the producer-owned organizations every advantage in raising, processing, and selling cotton at the expense of investor-owned firms.

This is done with the consent of Congress, of course. It is done with money raised through taxation. It is done with the best of intentions of helping the farmer, and in many cases it does. But, in the long run, it is giving a monopoly to a federally supported organization, and killing the competition which is needed and beneficial in any economic system.

This has been going on since 1933. It may be too late to stop now, but the News does not believe it is. There seems to be a chance that members of the cotton industry can develop a new spirit of compromise and cooperation in legislative objectives, and unite in asking Congress to develop a sound program. But something must be done very soon, at the grassroots level and in Washington.

M R

REPORT ON THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the National Observer of May 17 published an informative, on-the-scene report reviewing the chaotic events in Santo Domingo which led to the President's decision to dispatch American combat forces to that embattled city. I ask unanimous consent that this report, by Peter T. Chew, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Observer, May 17, 1965]
A NEW LATIN AMERICAN POLICY—HOW COMMUNISTS WERE THWARTED IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(By Peter T. Chew)

SANTO DOMINGO.—This half-mad city of 300,000 persons headed for a complete nervous breakdown late last week as Dominicans savaged each other again despite the presence of 30,000 U.S. military men and a commission from the Organization of American States (OAS).

With the explosiveness of a .50-caliber machinegun burst, everything blew to bits in one chaotic 24-hour period. When it was over, the cease-fire had been broken by both the Communist-led rebels of Col. Francisco Caamaño Deno and the junta forces of Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras.

As this was being written, an old propeller-driven P-51 Mustang of the Dominican Air Force, which is controlled by the Imbert "government of national reconstruction," was circling in the midafternoon sun like an angry bee, while rebels, six blocks away, "brrruppd" at it with machineguns and automatic rifles. Then the plane dove into another strafing run on rebel-held Radio Santo Domingo, which had been blasted off the air in earlier attacks.

When the week was over, the already chaotic situation here had grown immeasurably more so. But despite the confusion there is ample evidence that the U.S. mission here hasn't changed; nor its determination flagged.

A weary official of the U.S. Embassy here, his nerves obviously grown raw, put it this way:

"With his move into the Dominican Republic, President Johnson has adopted a new policy for Latin America—a Johnson policy, a Johnson doctrine, call it what you will—even though they are denying this in Washington. He has put the Communists on clear notice that we have at last drawn the line."

The official said that Mr. Johnson had served equally clear notice on the OAS to face up—and face up fast—to the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere and create a political and military force capable of moving quickly into such situations in the future.

If the OAS fails to do so, then the United States will not hesitate again and again to employ its awesome power unilaterally—and devil take the threadbare charges of gunboat diplomacy.

"For the first time since the end of the Second World War, your country has moved in the first second of the first round," said one Latin American diplomat in Santo Domingo delightedly.

The OAS men here are working long hours, but it is hard to determine if they are effective hours, and with each passing day more American soldiers and Dominicans are being killed and wounded. Here again, despite the perplexities of the political turmoil, it is obvious that the five-man OAS Commission has been shaken by what it has seen and heard.

Whether the small United Nations mission appointed Friday will find similarly is anyone's guess. It is supposed to report on the situation. The United States didn't want the U.N. here, and the rebels did, the OAS having shown signs of finding against the rebels.

WELCOMED BY AMBASSADORS

During the 36 to 48 hours before the Marines landed on April 28, this city witnessed a reign of terror unique in recent Latin American history. "There isn't a

single Latin American ambassador who doesn't thank his God that the Marines came when they did, whatever their governments may be saying," says one Latin American diplomat. As it was, half a dozen Latin American embassies alone were violated by the wild mobs.

When the OAS Commission members returned to Washington to report to their organization on May 7 and 8, they met behind closed doors at the Pan American Union. In one exchange, a dubious member asked if there had really been much evidence of Communist infiltration and danger to lives.

The Colombian member of the Commission—whose own country is having troubles with Communist guerrillas—replied emotionally:

"My answer is yes. This was not a situation where there are riots or guerrilla activities where constitutional authorities and law exist. In this case there is no state. What happens then when blood is shed in the streets? What should the inter-American system do when a country collapses?"

"Let's be frank. What happens when an American nation is so close to Cuba? Should we sit on the balcony and watch for the end of the tragedy? International communism is on the attack. There have been many revolutions in the Americas. We have had them in my own country, and I do not believe that a revolution justifies intervention by the inter-American system. This has not been my argument."

U.S. officials are quietly bitter because U.S. newspapers, many of whose reporters here appear to have become emotionally involved with the rebel cause despite the evidence of its Communist domination, gave little space to the OAS meeting. Typically, however, the OAS had made the transcript of the meeting available to the press on a Saturday night, an awkward time, and it was in Spanish.

DETAILS WERE LACKING

On the other hand, State Department men here 2 weeks ago were apparently allowed to reveal only the names of the Communists on the rebel side, while the specifics of who did what during those first hours of the revolution were released in great details in Washington.

Consequently, Mr. Caamaño and his aid, Hector Aristy Pereira, who guides his every move, were able to make many telling points with American newsmen. This has now changed, and there is evidence enough for everyone to have a little. Until the rebel radio was knocked out, for example, all one had to do was listen to bring back memories of Fidel Castro. All week long it has excoriated U.S. Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett as a fiend, a liar, and far worse. The radio has charged U.S. Marines and men of the Army's 82d Airborne Division with atrocities.

But with the passage of time, the true story is getting out. And if the United States has suffered a short-range blow to its image, its show of power should prove a long-range success with now unmeasurable implications. For the ambassadors of every country are filing reports to their governments. In the relative calm of his air-conditioned embassy here one day last week, a high-ranking Western diplomat said:

"In a matter of hours, this city was turned into a civil-war battlefield, in which the city was subjected to an incredibly stupid air bombardment by the Elias Wessin y Wessin forces, and a naval bombardment. Then the rebels handed out 20,000 modern automatic weapons to their mobs who proceeded to wreak their vengeance upon their enemies."

"Floors of hospital corridors were covered with injured and dying. There was no light, no heat, no power. Doctors were operating without anesthesia. All law, order, government authority was completely gone."

"If this horror—this reign of unorganized terror—had gone on for many more hours

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11421

His life as a marine was testimony to the military philosophy he once expressed:

Fashions in warfare changes as everything human changes, but the principles of warfare never change and the old soldierly virtues are the same that they have always been—courage and discipline and loyalty.

General Holcomb was a marine for nearly 44 years. Although he reached the mandatory retirement age in 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt announced he was continuing General Holcomb as Commandant of the Marine Corps in recognition of his outstanding service in that capacity. General Holcomb was retired on January 1, 1944. Because he had been specially commended for his performance of duty in actual combat, he was advanced one rank on the retirement list in accordance with a newly passed act of Congress. He thus became the first marine ever to hold the rank of general.

In a letter to General Holcomb, the late Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox said:

You will be the first officer of the corps to hold the rank of general—the highest rank in our Armed Forces. I know of no other officer to whom that distinction more fittingly belongs.

During General Holcomb's tour of duty as Commandant, the Marine Corps expanded from 16,000 men to about 300,000 men and women. The general was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for his outstanding work as Commandant in April 1944.

On March 9, 1944, the President nominated General Holcomb for the position of U.S. minister to the Union of South Africa. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate on March 20, and General Holcomb served as minister to the Union of South Africa until his retirement on June 15, 1948.

General Holcomb was a man of diverse interests. In line with his military service, he was a noted marksman and won many medals on military and civilian levels.

His duty tours included many years in China and he had a deep knowledge of that country. He was an American who had a speaking knowledge of more Chinese dialects than most Western scholars.

In the years since his retirement in 1948 from his post as minister to South Africa he maintained a deep interest in history, reading in depth on the events of World War II and military history in general.

His reputation for achievement, however, rested chiefly with the Marines and their readiness in the World War II fighting. In the uncertain days leading up to the war it had been his responsibility to see that the Marines were ready to defend their country in any eventuality.

The first major test came at Guadalcanal. And here the world learned again that the Marines' reputation for toughness and discipline was well deserved.

General Holcomb was born in New Castle in August 5, 1879, and joined the Marine Corps in 1900.

In World War I, he commanded a battalion of the 6th Regiment and won the Navy Cross, the Nation's second highest decoration for valor. A list of other medals and decoration includes the Silver Star Medal with three Oak-Leaf Clusters; the Purple Heart Medal; the Expeditionary Medal, China; the World War I Victory Medal with Aisne, Aisne-Marne, St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne, and defensive sector clasps; the Army of Occupation of Germany Medal; the American Defense Service Medal with base clasp; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with one bronze star, Guadalcanal; the American Campaign Medal; the World War II Victory Medal; the French Legion of Honor; the French Croix de Guerre with three palms; the Naval Order of Merit, first class (Cuban award), 1943; the Knight Grand Cross (Netherlands), 1944; and the French Fourragere.

We, in Delaware, were especially proud of General Holcomb, and I know the Nation shares this pride. We express our sympathy to his son, Franklin P. Holcomb, of Paris; his four grandchildren; his nephew, Thomas Holcomb II, of New Castle; and the niece with whom he made his home in New Castle, Mrs. Paul Warley.

**CENTENNIAL OF WILLIAM E. BORAH:
RESOLUTION OF IDAHO STATE
SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I have received from the officers of the Idaho State Society of Washington, D.C., a resolution, expressing their desire to initiate and participate in activities to observe this centennial year of one of Idaho's most illustrious lawmakers ever to have served in the U.S. Senate, William E. Borah.

So that others may be aware of this worthwhile tribute to be paid by the Idaho State Society to a man so well and so firmly fixed in the history of Idaho and the Nation, I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the first official meeting of the 1965-66 officers of the Idaho State Society of Washington, D.C., duly convened at Washington, D.C., on the 2d day of April 1965, and considered the matter of participating in the observance of the William E. Borah Centennial on June 29, 1965; and

Whereas the date of the centennial and the desirability of the society's participation in the observance was announced at the annual meeting of the membership on the 26th day of March 1965; and

Whereas the members of the Idaho State Society of Washington, D.C., have expressed the desire to participate in activities to honor William E. Borah and to share in the observance of the centennial; and

Whereas Idahoans wish to mark a significant milestone in memory of one of Idaho's most illustrious lawmakers ever to have served in the Congress of the United States: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Idaho State Society of Washington, D.C., pledges to initiate plans for an observance in Washington, D.C., and to cooperate in furthering those activities designed to cause a fitting and appropriate

observance to be held in commemoration of the William E. Borah Centennial on June 29, 1965.

WADE B. FLEETWOOD,
President, Idaho State Society of Wash-
ing, D.C.

LEE ANNA RUTTMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Idaho State Society
of Washington, D.C.

COTTON LEGISLATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the president of the Texas Cotton Association, Raymond S. Tapp, recently called to my attention a most worthwhile editorial published in the Dallas Morning News.

The editorial writer asks the vital question:

Is cotton on its death bed?

In order that other Senators may share the views of both President Tapp and the Morning News, I ask that the letter and editorial be printed in the RECORD.

I hope the reading of these wise remarks will spur the Senate to greater efforts in the vital job of writing meaningful legislation which will come to grips with the problems besetting the cotton industry. We owe this great American industry no less than our careful attention and our best efforts.

There being no objection, the letter and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TEXAS COTTON ASSOCIATION,
Waco, Tex., May 20, 1965.

Senator JOHN TOWER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Enclosed is a very apropos lead editorial from the May 18 Dallas Morning News. I hope it will help open the public's eyes as to what is happening to a once great industry and a primary source for equalization of balance-of-payments dollars.

The economy of the Southwest will suffer greatly unless we can obtain legislation that will allow cotton to be marketed through normal channels of trade at competitive prices. This can be accomplished if the following three suggestions are followed in any new cotton legislative program: (1) Payments must be made directly to the producer without discrimination for operational size and efficiency in order to maintain a healthy farm income, but in a manner that does not deny the function of price. (2) The price of American cotton must be left free to respond to world marketing mechanisms without any attempt at price edit by the Government. (3) Our present 16-million-acre minimum must be maintained and additional acreage allotted as we regain our export markets. This type of legislation would help regain our foreign markets, discourage expansion of synthetics and foreign cotton production, therefore greatly improving and securing the farm economy of this area.

We hope you will help us secure the type of legislation we so badly need for the survival of the cotton industry.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND S. TAPP,
President, The Texas Cotton Association.

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 18, 1965]

LAST ILLNESS?

Is cotton on its deathbed? Many who know the crop best fear that it is. If cotton is dying, Texas and the Nation are losing great economic assets. If cotton is breathing its last, it is being killed by its friends, so-

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11423

and your marines had not come, then several extra thousand people might have been killed. These tigres, as they call themselves—young punks who would kill you for a ham sandwich—were whizzing down the street in cars shooting in all directions. It was a typical civil war—cruel and insane stupid.

"Twenty armed men came clumping up the stairs of this embassy and I dismissed them. It was all very unpleasant. Communists? The rebels are up to their necks in them."

REBELS SOUGHT VISAS

Many of the rebels, he said, sought visas from him in the past in order to make their way to Cuba and Iron Curtain countries, and he had refused to grant them. They had managed to get out anyway.

The Western diplomat, who fought as a high-ranking officer in the Second World War, said many of the street fighters of the rebel side had shown evidence of the most sophisticated urban guerrilla warfare training. It's not the sort of training that the rag-tag Dominican armed forces, whence many of the rebels came, ever receive.

Had President Johnson not moved so swiftly, many Americans at the embattled little Embassy—and hundreds of others who elected to stick it out here and not evacuate—might well have been killed.

ATTACK ON THE EMBASSY

The Embassy had been informed by both loyalist and rebel leaders that they could not guarantee the safety of Americans or any other foreign nationals. One short hour after U.S. Marines raced up to the Embassy in truck and Embassy cars that had met them at the helicopter field beside the Embajador Hotel, a large force of rebels attacked the Embassy. And for 5 straight days and nights before and after the Marines arrival, the Embassy came under heavy fire.

Ambassador Bennett, a tall, sensitive man who speaks with soft Georgia accent—"he's hardly the 'hawk' type, he's much too subtle for that," says an aid—knew that the Dominican powder keg was due for a blow. U.S. intelligence had put together a fat dossier on Communists, and the Ambassador had reports that Juan Bosch, from his exile in Puerto Rico, was working closely with them in an attempt to regain power.

Mr. Bennett seized his last clear chance to fly back to Washington and report, and he was there when the revolution against the military-backed government of Donald Reid Cabral broke out on Saturday morning, April 24. Mr. Bennett flew back here on Wednesday, April 28. And as he drove into town from the port of Haina, where he'd been dropped by a Marine helicopter from the heli-carrier *Boxer*, he met U.S. refugees streaming down the road in cars from the Embajador Hotel. There they had been terrorized by a rebel band who had fired bursts over their heads and through the lobby.

THE MARINES LANDED

Time and time again that day he reported to Mr. Johnson on the phone that he didn't want the Marines to come ashore unless they absolutely had to. Finally, at 5:14 p.m., Mr. Johnson gave the order for them to land.

The Ambassador is known to be appalled at criticism that the United States over-reacted to the crisis, and that it should have expended precious hours consulting all members of the OAS. "An ambassador's first duty is to his citizens," he has said repeatedly in recent days. "Did they want me to wait until the coffin was already prepared?"

Mr. Bennett is also of the belief that Gen. Wessin y Wessin—a leader of the junta that removed Bosch from the Presidency—is not the beast that he has been painted.

Many Americans, and other nationals who lived through the first terrifying days before the Marines arrived, are thankful that Wessin, although defeated in battle by the rebels, was able to hold them up at all. The Communists, and many people in the streets, have made much of the number killed by Wessin in air raids on the Duarte Bridge area, and the results were undoubtedly bloody. But many there do not think it compares with the numbers killed by roving bands of rebels with guns.

The best information now is that Caamano would personally like to seek a compromise with the present Imbert junta—or even come across the lines and defect, but that he is now literally a prisoner of the Communists.

Some sources emphasize that none of the prominent political followers of Bosch who were in on the original coup of April 24 are now in the rebel ranks, men like Rafael Molena Urena having sought asylum in Latin American embassies.

In fact, during the first 24-odd hours of the coup, Caamano himself took refuge in an embassy. His name didn't figure prominently until Tuesday, April 27, by which time most Bosch leaders had fled and the Communists had moved neatly into the vacuum.

A SHADY FIGURE

U.S. officials here invariably describe Hector Aristy as a shadowy figure, and an opportunist. Some believe he has been a Communist all along. They say of Bosch that he is probably not a Communist, but that he has been playing the Communist game for too long.

A widely held theory here is that Bosch could never summon the courage to return during this crisis. Another theory holds that he may yet be the winner. He has kept his leftwing credentials first class by denouncing the Marines as sort of an institutionalized McCarthyism. But he has not rushed to join the rebels either, for whatever the degree of Communist control, the taint is there.

Bosch attained power in this country's first honest election, and here lies part of the tragedy of this situation. Ironically, Bosch had the backing in that election of the military, but after his election he tried to reform their varied forms of graft. At the same time, he gave encouragement to leftists. And General Wessin, himself a puritanical type of man not given to the usual corruption, genuinely believed Bosch was setting up the country for a Communist takeover.

Bosch, say officials here, was a victim of his own mercurial personality, and a dangerously divisive influence on the country. He injected a high degree of racism into his successful campaign for the presidency. He kept using the term, *tutum pote*, which means the white wealthy upper class suppressors of the poor colored peoples.

He's a man of lower-middle-class background, a scholar with a rapier-like wit and scorn. These are not Dominican traits. He left many wefts on assorted hides, and he absolutely refused to sit down at a table and heal old wounds.

So far, no single, charismatic Communist figure has arisen on the rebel side. Believed to be high in the Communist leadership, however, are the Ducoudray brothers—Juan Ducoudray Mansfield and Felix Servio Ducoudray, Jr.—long-time Communist leaders in this country. At a lower level is an old friend of Fidel Castro, Rafael Pichirilo Mejia, who is now leading a large armed band.

Mejia was helmsman of the *Gramma*, the converted yacht that carried Castro and 80-odd followers from Mexico to Oriente Province in Cuba. After graduating from all the best guerrilla schools and serving Castro in various capacities, this tough little Communist returned to his native Dominican Re-

public when Bosch came to power and served in his administration. When Bosch went into exile, Mejia and other Communists fled the country. In the intervening years, he became a gun-runner and smuggler, using the proceeds to support Red subversion.

Reports have it that he was aboard the *Santo Domingo* when that freighter was sunk last week in the Ozama River after delivering arms to the rebels on the west bank. When the 82d Airborne sank the vessel, Mejia must have escaped, because he has been seen around the rebel sector in recent days.

Obviously, not everyone in the rebel camp is a Communist; indeed, Communists are probably a minority. But this was true also in the Cuban (and Russian) revolutions. It is a question of the influence they can bring to bear.

Around rebel headquarters you see carbon copies of *Fidelistas*—complete with fatigues and beards—among the Caamano bodyguard.

Officially, the United States is maintaining a neutral stance between the Imbert and Caamano regimes until such time as the OAS can take effective political action. Unofficially, of course, the Imbert group, which is located physically within the U.S.-protected international zone—represents the friendlies and the rebels are unfriendlies.

Throughout the week, it appeared that the OAS might be making some progress, and Friday some 250 Honduran troops and a few Costa Ricans arrived. And despite continuous sniper fire and sporadic firefights between U.S. soldiers and rebels, between rebels and loyalists, and between rebels and rebels, there has been a cease-fire of sorts.

Then, on Wednesday, a large rebel group attacked a loyalist motor pool in force, technically breaking the cease-fire. The Dominican Air Force, consisting of a handful of P-51's, AT-6 trainers, and British-made Vampire jet fighters, thereupon apparently decided it was free to have at the rebels again.

The air force is located at San Isidro Air Base which is guarded by the 82d Airborne.

A JOINT OPERATION

The tower at San Isidro is a joint United States-loyalist-Dominican operation. When a loyalist plane wants to take off, a Dominican in the tower clears it. On Thursday afternoon, two P-51's and three bomb-carrying AT-6's streaked off the field and attacked the rebel radio station.

One of the P-51's started its strafing run just as it swept low over the U.S. Embassy, its guns making a frightening racket. Ambassador Bennett and his staff dived under their desks. U.S. Marines guarding the embassy grounds opened fire on the fighter, not sure of its intentions.

Enraged by the attack on his station, Caamano produced for U.S. newsmen the body of a child killed in the attack, and charged the Imbert people with breaking the cease-fire.

Well, it wasn't much of a cease-fire anyway. Every afternoon last week, for example, snipers in a construction gang on a building overlooking a U.S. Marine position would fire a few bursts, then melt into the street crowd. The Marines, armed with M-14 rifles and binoculars, stalk and kill the snipers in return.

Unarmed Dominican civilians travel back and forth into the international zone—through Marine and airborne checkpoints where they are frisked for weapons. Thus rebels can move about freely without arms and spot U.S. positions.

In the international zone, the native Dominicans go about their business amidst the gunfire as though nothing were hap-

May 26, 1965

pening. On Thursday, they appeared to enjoy watching the strafing runs.

In the corridor, and along the perimeter, U.S. troops are distributing food and clothing to all comers. And all the while, a battery of six mean-looking 105-millimeter howitzers—conspicuously emplaced in front of the Hotel Embajador for all to see—are pointed toward the 8-square-mile rebel sector. They could pulverize rebel town in a few days of firing if they had to.

With or without a token OAS force, it's a good bet those guns will be in place for a long time to come.

THE ROLE OF THE U.S. MERCHANT FLEET

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on May 12, Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, delivered an excellent address before the Propeller Club, in Newport News, Va. Mr. Hood stated that the decline of certain segments of the U.S. merchant fleet "has reached a point where we are now faced with the danger of losing control over the orderly movement of our foreign commerce—if, indeed, this control has not already been lost."

I could not agree with him more.

It is becoming more and more apparent that the future of the American merchant marine depends on a healthy climate in which labor, management, shippers, investors, lending institutions, and the general public alike will have sound reason and positive justification for renewed faith and confidence in the future of American-flag shipping.

We have had our seminars and symposiums, our debates and roundtable discussions. Now, as Mr. Hood has declared, "talk must soon be replaced by positive action—otherwise our maritime strength will decline even further."

At a point in our history, when the American merchant marine carries less than 10 percent of our foreign commerce, I am certain that all Senators will be interested in the entire text of Mr. Hood's timely remarks. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR A PROGRAM

The role of the U.S. merchant fleet in the national scheme of things is a timely topic.

Timely because the predominant share of the transport of our foreign commerce has been surrendered to ships of other nations. This has progressed to the point where the American merchant marine carries less than 10 percent of this trade. The transport of oil, bulk commodities and tramp cargoes in U.S. bottoms has faded drastically. This decline has reached a point where we are now faced with the danger of losing control over the orderly movement of our foreign commerce, if indeed this control has not already been lost.

Timely because, as V-E Day on May 8 reminded us, 20 years have passed since World War II, the era when much of our present fleet was built. It is bad enough that we carry so little, but worse that much of what we do carry is in old ships built in World War II days.

It is timely, too, because of current recognition of the pressing requirement to revitalize our merchant marine as evidenced by new interest and discourse at the highest levels of Government and industry. Most

experts agree that the scope of our merchant marine must reflect the dynamics of present-day commerce. However, there is considerable disagreement as to the kinds of changes that are needed and as to the emphasis to be placed on the various segments which comprise the maritime industry.

And, the topic is critically timely to those of us in the shipbuilding industry, for it has been proposed that ships for the U.S.-flag merchant marine might be built in foreign shipyards as a means of eliminating shipbuilding subsidies. This "trial balloon," as it has been characterized by many, comes at a time when practically every other maritime nation of the world is moving to strengthen their shipping and shipbuilding activities in their own self-interests.

The mere suggestion that the U.S. Government might sanction the building of ships for the subsidized merchant fleet in foreign shipyards has caused our counterparts around the world to "rub their hands together" with gleeful anticipation. Even though our Secretary of Commerce publicly asserted on March 3, 1965, that because of the balance-of-payments problem, the policy of the administration is to require ship construction in this country, the foreign trade journals continue to applaud the "build abroad" proposal suggested by the Maritime Administrator on February 9, 1965. In fact, even in this country, few periodicals mention the March 3 statement by the Secretary, and the earlier February 9 statement continues to receive notoriety.

The situation also has a comical flavor. The Japanese are fearful that if, as a matter of U.S. policy, ships for the U.S. fleet were to be constructed abroad, European shipyards would obtain most of the contracts. And, the European nations, particularly those in the Common Market, are fearful that the Japanese, because of their lower prices, will receive all of the business. It can be reasonably predicted that these fears are already being expressed in trade discussions and through diplomatic channels. And, the Norwegians are now attributing the financial plight of their shipyards to our Government's restrictions on foreign lending by U.S. banks.

Japan, as you know, is the leading shipbuilding nation of the world. In 1964, her shipyards cornered 40 percent of the world shipbuilding market. In addition to benefiting from wage rates well below one-half the level of wages in the United States, Japanese shipyards are supported by their government to the extent of 10 percent of the actual cost price of each ship. This support, it is said, includes a subsidy on steel plates used in connection with export shipbuilding contracts plus favorable credit terms arranged under Government sponsorship and guarantees. Profits earned from export sales are also largely tax free.

These competitive advantages have prompted the Common Market countries to respond in kind. More subsidies and more liberal credit and financing terms are in the offing. Starting in 1967, it is recommended by the European Economic Community that member nations grant their shipyards a subsidy amounting to 10 percent of the actual value of newly built ships. There are indications that this 10-percent figure might be increased later. There are also reports that a separate subsidy of 5 percent on ship repairs may be proposed. France and Italy already provide direct subsidies of 15 to 20 percent to stimulate the shipyard industry.

It is important to note that all of this is taking place at a time when there are those in this country who advocate the elimination of shipyard subsidies. Other maritime nations obviously consider their shipyards of sufficient national importance to warrant greater support, and we appear to want to make it even easier for them to do so.

At this point, I should remind you that U.S. taxpayers have spent nearly \$1 billion since 1945 in rehabilitating war damaged foreign shipyards and in defraying costs of mutual security contracts awarded many of the same yards. In addition, I should remind you that since the close of World War II, more than 1,000 merchant vessels totaling 18 million gross tons have been built in foreign shipyards for American interests. In the same period, U.S. shipyards delivered 581 ships totaling 7.4 million gross tons to American interests.

Against the background of what is taking place in Europe, it was interesting to read the other day that a Swedish ship operator had characterized ship construction subsidies as "formidable weapons in the hands of American owners." Rather than formidable weapons, ship construction subsidies—and also ship operating subsidies—represent nothing more, and nothing less, than payments to offset the difference between U.S. and foreign wage scales. The Joint Economic Committee of the Congress recently noted that the only Federal statutes using the word "subsidy" are those dealing with ship construction and ship operations. The term is also rarely used in Executive orders and Government regulations.

Perhaps by calling a spade a spade—by changing the designation of ship construction and ship operating subsidies to "labor equalization payments" or to some other appropriate term—many of the roadblocks associated with maritime problems in this country will take on an entirely different connotation. Then, indeed, "labor equalization payments" will be "formidable weapons" in terms of correcting the deficiencies in our merchant fleet, in preserving our shipyards, and in meeting the ever-growing threat of the Russians on the high seas.

But, the attainment of these goals will require more than just a change in name. A healthy environment must be created in which labor, management, shippers, investors, lending institutions, and the general public alike will have sound reason and positive justifications for renewed faith and confidence in the future for American-flag shipping. This climate, however, will not be created by contradictory suggestions from Government sources that our ships might or might not be built abroad. Nor will it be created by any official hemming or hawing. It will not be created by window dressing or tricks of legerdemain. Nor will it be created by begging the issue of subsidies.

In point of truth, an effective maritime effort would not be possible without protective measures such as ship operating and ship construction subsidies. The focus of those who endorse revitalization of the American maritime industry while reducing subsidies has been blurred by not recognizing this fundamental reality. There is no way we can legislate away or wish away the differences in wage levels which are an inherent economic fact among nations of differing affluence. Nor is there justification to singling out the maritime industry generally or the shipyards in particular and concluding they are less efficient and more expendable than other segments of our economy.

To begin with, the issue is primarily that of maintaining the high level of well-being of our citizens. Even a minimal extent of research quickly demonstrates that with surprisingly few exceptions U.S. products and services cost more than those of other nations. Just because many American industries and service firms receive indemnification from direct price competition with foreign concerns by indirect, oblique, obscured means, while the maritime industry receives direct open support with subsidy payments, is no reason to ignore this commonplace, basic fact of international economics. It is no reason to claim that ship

May 26, 1965

every other employer pays. As a matter of fact employers of tipped employees have enjoyed an advantage over other employers for many years.

4. The suggestion has been made by the opponents that waiters be treated as self-employed persons. This is a contradiction in terms and an absurdity. Waiters are not self-employed; they work for employers who pay them wages, regulate their hours of work, hire or fire them, and decide their conditions of employment. The ridiculous attempt to classify them as self-employed has only one purpose—to shift the entire cost of social security on the employees.

5. Tips have been recognized as wages for social security purposes for certain categories of waiters for several years. These are waiters whose tips are fixed in an agreement between the employer and the guest and are paid by the guest to the employer and by the employer to the waiter. Why not cover all waiters?

Hundreds of thousands of waiters and other tipped employees throughout the country look up to your committee for justice in this matter. You have it in your hands to help these workers and their families enjoy the blessings of our democratic society as they meet its obligations. Please undo this injustice and grant to these hard working citizens the same rights as are enjoyed by all other American workers under the Social Security Act. Approve section 205 of S. 1.

Sincerely,

DAVID SIEGAL,
President, Joint Board.
A. SUSI,
Secretary-Treasurer, Joint Board.
DAVID SIEGAL,
President, Local No. 1.
E. SARNI ZUCCA,
Secretary, Local No. 1.

CENTENNIAL OF CONNECTICUT DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the end of this month marks the completion of the centennial year of the Connecticut State Dental Association during this year the Connecticut State Dental Association has sponsored many dental education and health programs calling attention to the importance of oral health. During these 100 years the people of the whole Nation have benefited greatly from the accomplishments and contributions of Connecticut dentists.

Although I will have the honor of greeting the convention which will mark the completion of the centennial celebration indicating a century of progress, I would like to take time today to honor the Connecticut dental profession with these remarks.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague in recognizing the achievements of the Connecticut State Dental Association.

Connecticut dentists have long distinguished themselves and their profession by their contribution to dentistry and to humanity.

Dr. Horace Hayden, of Windsor, Conn., was a cofounder of the first dental college in the United States in 1840, and was a leader in establishing the first national dental association and the first dental journal in the world.

Dr. Horace Well, of Hartford, has been acclaimed for his discovery and use of anesthesia in 1845.

Dr. Alfred C. Fones, of Bridgeport, has been hailed as the father of dental hygiene. Dr. Emmeline Roberts Jones, of Danielson, was our Nation's first woman dentist.

I congratulate the Connecticut State Dental Association and each of its members upon their 100th anniversary and I wish them another century of distinguished service to the people of Connecticut and the United States.

OAS SHOULD FORM HEMISPHERIC POLICE FORCE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we should begin work now for the establishment of a multinational police force to protect freedom throughout the Western Hemisphere. Already a skeleton force has been organized in the Dominican Republic. Working through the Organization of American States, we should now urge that a permanent peacekeeping unit be formed.

I first recommended the establishment of such a force in October 1963, when uprisings plagued the Dominican Republic and Honduras. Our problems in the Dominican Republic today underscore the need for a permanent police force.

The organization I envision would be equipped to move rapidly to protect popular, democratic governments against military takeovers. The force would be employed:

First, when requested by a popularly elected government to protect its own internal security; and second, at direction of the ruling body of the Organization of American States.

Each member of the Organization of American States would be requested to designate a small contingent of troops and equipment to be available on short notice. Command of this international force would rest with OAS.

The President's action in the Dominican Republic, I believe, has successfully stopped the threat of a Communist takeover in that country. However, it is the stated intent of Cuban Communists and their friends to continue efforts throughout Latin America to disrupt and eventually replace popular governments.

A quick-acting hemispheric police force, ready on a moment's notice at the call of a nation in need, would effectively reduce this threat.

I would urge that the President instruct our delegates to the Organization of American States to begin discussions now within that body leading to the establishment of this force.

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record two truly remarkable articles by Virginia Prewett, Washington Daily News columnist on Latin America and winner of the Maria Moors Cabot Gold Medal for outstanding hemisphere coverage in 1964.

I believe that the appearance of these articles, which bear the hallmark of unmistakable authenticity, is most timely. Indeed, I think they constitute the most

effective answer that has yet been made to those reckless critics of the administration who, instead of giving their Government the benefit of the doubt, lashed out frenetically at imaginary failings and errors.

Among the false charges that were made were these:

That the President intervened against the "constitutional" rebels in favor of an unpopular military clique, that the President had acted without informing the OAS, that Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann had masterminded the Dominican landing.

Miss Prewett, in her series of articles for the Washington Daily News, refutes these charges and sets forth an hour-by-hour log of the events that led to the decision of intervention.

I hope that my colleagues will all find the time to read Miss Prewett's highly informative articles.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INSIDE STORY: THE ORDER TO LAND THE MARINES

(By Virginia Prewett)

At 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 28, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson and five of his top advisers were discussing Vietnam at the White House. An urgent message from the Dominican Republic interrupted him.

There was silence in the little, newly decorated green west wing lounge as the President scanned the slip of paper. He sat in his favorite high-backed deep-cushioned chair, his long legs stretched out by the hassock he often props them on. On the wall nearby hung a new decoration that he proudly shows visitors—the pictures of five Presidents with whom he has worked, mounted in one frame.

ADVISED

With him were Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Special Assistant for National Security McGeorge Bundy, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, Assistant Secretary of State George Ball, and Special Assistant Bill Moyers.

The President told them that all the nine top U.S. officials in our Santo Domingo Embassy requested urgent military assistance to save American lives in the Dominican Republic.

Earlier messages had warned that Santo Domingo city was engulfed in anarchy. About 1,000 American men, women, and children, gathered for evacuation at the Hotel Embajador at the city's edge, were cut off from the escape route via the little Caribbean port of Haina, 9 miles away. The U.S.S. Boxer and other naval ships had been lying off Haina since Sunday, April 25.

THE MARINES

President Johnson and his advisers now discussed sending in U.S. Marines to protect the stranded Americans.

At 6:30 the President gave an order that made April 28, 1965, one of the world's historic dates, comparable in drama to October 22, 1962, the day of the Cuban missile showdown. He sent in the Marines. President Johnson immediately started a series of statements and speeches to assure the world he sent them to save lives. He revealed that a Communist apparatus had been spotted surfacing in the anarchy. He stated his goal: to restore peace and help establish democratic government in the Dominican Republic.

The great majority of Americans, say the public opinion polls, heard and approved. But the image of Marine landings has been

May 26, 1965

used in anti-American propaganda for over half a century.

Latin American nationalists use it. Nazis used it before World War II and the Communists before and since. Most Americans, if they think about it, disapprove of the Caribbean landings of the 1920's, when Calvin Coolidge said: "The business of the United States is business."

Woodrow Wilson's still earlier Marines missions in the Caribbean to counteract German plotting during World War I and to try to help along democracy afterward were blurred by the later use of the Marines in "Dollar Diplomacy."

OUTLAY

Two criticisms greeted the Johnson action on April 28. There was outcry in the unfriendly segment of the U.S. press that the President did not amply consult our Latin American allies in the Organization of American States. Senator ROBERT KENNEDY echoed this in a public statement comparing President Johnson's action with those of his late brother, and faulting President Johnson.

Next, the President was accused of intervening to help an unpopular military clique, headed by Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, against constitutional rebels favoring the deposed President Juan Bosch.

The administration had to endure these charges for the moment. Refuting them would have hindered chances of progress in the fast-moving Dominican situation.

CHARGES REFUTED

But Mr. Johnson's firefighting team confounded the critics first by attempting to get General Wessin to step out in the interest of a coalition. Again, Mr. Johnson refuted the charge of favoring the military clique by sending a top team to Santo Domingo to try to negotiate a coalition headed by Antonio Guzman, a former member of Bosch's Cabinet.

Nevertheless, as U.S. efforts to help settle tangled problems of personalities and power in the tragic country continued, a world debate rolled on about the intervention itself.

Speculation returns again and again to Mr. Johnson's reasons for intervening. And the impression rolls on, often cited as a fact, that he did not bring the Organization of American States into the crisis.

MANN'S ROLE

As a corollary, President Johnson is charged with being overpersuaded by his former Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, the present Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Thomas C. Mann.

The left-of-center Americans for Democratic Action, who do not like Mr. Mann because he is supposed to have favored sending U.S. military help to the Cuban exile brigade battling at the Bay of Pigs, have officially demanded Mr. Mann's resignation for supposedly masterminding the Dominican landing.

The charge is false.

The answer to these continuing questions should not be lost to history as a new black legend of U.S. intervention hardens now in 1965. The story can now be told.

At its briefest, it is this:

The immediate reason for landing the marines was to save American lives. The growing danger of a second Cuba on the Island of Hispaniola reinforced the President's determination.

MANN'S FATE

But Mr. Mann was not even present at the meeting when President Johnson and his advisers first considered landing the Marines. And incidentally, the untrue ADA attack has guaranteed Mr. Mann will be in U.S. Government as long as Lyndon B. Johnson is President.

Moreover, the charge that the United States acted without the knowledge of the other member states of the OAS is not so.

The White House and the U.S. State Department, long before the order to land Marines was given, had established contacts with Latin American Embassies over the situation. The machinery of the OAS had already been set in motion, at U.S. request. Not only were the Embassies in Santo Domingo of South American countries notified, the Washington Embassies were as well.

President Johnson, when he ordered in the Marines, also ordered all Latin American embassies in Washington to be notified as quickly as possible of the landing and of the U.S. request for an OAS meeting at the earliest possible hour. By 10 that night, all were notified.

The day-by-day log of events as they affected the White House will tell the story.

THE INSIDE STORY: KNOWN REDS SPOTTED DURING ARMS HANDOUT
(By Virginia Prewett)

Trouble broke in the Dominican Republic at 3 p.m., on Saturday, April 24. Army officers seized their chief of staff and Santo Domingo's most powerful radio station proclaimed a coup against President Donald Reid Cabral.

Former President Juan Bosch was not mentioned.

The White House was informed. Coup threats had been frequent since Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin and other officers deposed Juan Bosch in September 1963. But General Wessin did not move that Saturday.

At 5 a.m. Sunday, the White House was told the revolt was serious. At 7:10, Sr. Bosch, by radio from Puerto Rico, named Jose Rafael Molina Urena "constitutional president" for his cause. General Wessin now acted. Crowds around the centrally located presidential palace shouted for Sr. Bosch. At 10:30 a.m. President Reid Cabral resigned.

NAVY MOVES

At 8:45 Sunday morning, President Johnson from Camp David ordered U.S. Navy ships to move near Santo Domingo and lie offshore, out of sight.

This was no novelty. When the longtime Dominican dictator, Rafael L. Trujillo, was assassinated in May 30, 1961, the then Vice President Johnson, acting for President Kennedy in his absence, sent U.S. Navy ships to stand off Santo Domingo.

President Kennedy himself sent them there in December 1961, when Trujillo's surviving family threatened to retake power.

President Johnson learned on Monday, April 26, that Santo Domingo's city manager around 11:30 a.m. called to urge our Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett: "Do something about your people for God's sake!" Rioting and fighting had spread. The Pepsi Cola plant, an American symbol, was burned and bottles were stolen for Molotov cocktails.

At noon Monday, the Embassy began warning all Americans to gather for evacuation at the Hotel Embajador, on the city's outskirts. About 2,500 Americans were in Santo Domingo—diplomats' families, business residents, tourists.

At 5 p.m. Sunday, the Dominican Air Force joined General Wessin. On Monday, they bombed the presidential palace and strafed the rebel-held end of the strategic Ozama bridge.

On Monday, the rebel radio broadcast the names and addresses of the pilots' families. The pilots' wives and mothers were taken to the Ozama bridge as hostages against further strafing.

On Monday, our State Department discussed the situation with the Brazilian and Chilean diplomats.

A cease-fire was arranged for from 11 a.m. till 2 p.m. on Tuesday, so the 1,170 Americans at the Embajador could be taken by bus to Haina port and evacuated.

LUCKY

Soon after 8 a.m. Tuesday, an armed rabble burst into the Embajador. They had been given rifles and tommyguns by defecting army men. They sprayed bullets over the heads of prostrate Americans inside and outside the hotel. By luck, no one was shot.

The later cease-fire held long enough for the Americans to reach Haina, 9 miles away.

That same morning, Colombia's OAS Ambassador, Emilio N. Oribe, called on Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America Jack Hood Vaughn. They discussed bringing the OAS into the crisis.

White House approval was prompt. And at Tuesday noon, the U.S. alternate representative to the OAS, Ward Allen, called an urgent meeting of the Peace Committee.

The Committee, composed of the United States, Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Colombia and Nicaragua, discussed calling an emergency foreign ministers' meeting.

ENVOYS CONCERNED

When President Johnson checked reports later, he saw that Mr. Vaughn had also briefed the Venezuelans. At 7 p.m., he learned, the Costa Rican Embassy asked U.S. aid in evacuating Costa Ricans. During the day, the Embassies of both Peru and Ecuador called our State Department to express concern about their nationals. They stressed the need to protect their nationals and to protect law and order in Santo Domingo.

A little later, LBJ learned with relief that the first thousand or so evacuees were safe aboard American vessels. New refugees were filling the Hotel Embajador.

General Wessin's men were attacking heavily. In the late afternoon, Molina Urena and 15 rebels, including Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, called on Ambassador Bennett and asked him to help arrange a settlement. Mr. Bennett tried, but the move failed.

Around Tuesday midnight, Molina Urena took refuge in an embassy. Col. Caamano left the front of the stage. He did not reappear as rebel chief until April 30.

On Wednesday morning, President Johnson learned more arms were passed out indiscriminately.

REDS EFFICIENT

"I never saw such efficiency," read an eyewitness report. "Thousands of rifles were distributed in what seemed minutes." Known communists were spotted in the operation, which bore the earmarks of para-military planning.

President Johnson had known for months that Castroite communists planned to take over the expected action against Sr. Reid Cabral. Now they were surfacing. The TV took on a "Castro tone." Shouts of "pardon! (To the firing wall!)" were increasing in the tumult.

At 10:30 a.m. Wednesday, our OAS Ambassador, Ellsworth Bunker, briefed the OAS Council.

Around noon came more messages. Colombian Ambassador Jesus Zarate reported from Santo Domingo: "It is now a question of communists versus anti-communists."

A bank had been looted, police stations overrun. Thousands were dead and wounded.

YANKS CUT OFF

The Americans at the Embajador were cut off from Haina. Soon after 1 p.m. Wednesday, the President learned the crisis was worsening.

In the afternoon, Col. Pedro Benoit, in charge of military ground forces, warned he could not protect the Americans. Police chief Col. German Despradel said the same.

At 5:30 p.m., when President Johnson was discussing Vietnam problems with Dean Rusk, Robert McNamara, George Ball, George Bundy and Bill Moyers, came the plea for military assistance.

After discussing landing Marines, LBJ sent out calls to other officials. They included

Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, Ambassador Bunker, Mr. Vaughn, Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann, CIA director William Raborn, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle Wheeler—the full team.

The hard and historic decision had to be made.

CONNECTICUT JOINT RESOLUTION SUPPORTS ADMINISTRATION POLICIES IN VIETNAM AND DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. DODD. Mr. President I take great personal pride in bringing to the attention of my colleagues a joint resolution of the legislature of my home State, Connecticut, which records its strong "approval of the decisions of the President to use our armed strength with restraint yet firmness until such time as the peoples of those areas may be able to resolve their own futures in peace, and that we further express our admiration for the members of our own Armed Forces who are serving far from home under difficult and perilous conditions."

Because resolutions like this deserve the attention of all Americans, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record Connecticut House Joint Resolution 179, supporting U.S. policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

In these difficult days when our actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are under attack by the Communist propaganda apparatus and by a small number of vociferous critics at home, it is indeed heartening to hear the steady, although unsensationalized, voices of approval which represent, I am convinced, the opinions of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

Although these acts have not been characterized by fanfare and although they have received relatively little attention from the press, I am confident that the joint resolution adopted by the Connecticut State Legislature supporting the administration's policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, and similar resolutions which have been endorsed by citizens' organizations and student bodies in various parts of the country far more truly reflect the thinking of our citizens than the noisy and highly publicized manifestations of opposition.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 179
Resolution supporting U.S. policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas there has been criticism of the actions of the President of the United States in defending the cause of freedom in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic; and

Whereas such criticism, however well-intentioned, may tend to create abroad a false impression that the people of the United States do not support their Chief Executive in his attempt to assist the people of South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic against subversion and aggression; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Connecticut General Assembly, do hereby record our strong approval of the decisions of the President to use our armed strength

with restraint, yet firmness, until such time as the peoples of those areas may be able to resolve their own futures in peace, and that we further express our admiration for the members of our own Armed Forces who are serving far from home under difficult and perilous conditions; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the senate and house of representatives be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Secretary of Defense of the United States.

Clerk of the Senate.

Clerk of the House.

HOMER CROY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I know that all Missourians and many other citizens throughout the Nation were saddened to learn of the death, yesterday, of the famed novelist and long-time Missouri resident, Homer Croy, who died in New York, at the age of 82. Homer Croy gained his fame as a novelist and screen writer, but most especially as a chronicler of the 19th century West. He was one of the first students of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, the first such institution in the Nation. The author of many fascinating and adventure-filled novels, he was, in real life, equally as colorful and as interesting an individual as Molly Brown, Jessie James, or the other true-life or fictional characters that peopled his books. Certainly this fact is attested by the interesting article published today in the New York Times—some of it in his own words. Although his passing certainly means a great loss to Missouri, we are warmed by the knowledge that his place in the literary history of America is secure.

I ask that the New York Times article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 26, 1965]
HOMER CROY DIES; NOVELIST WAS 82—ALSO DID BIOGRAPHIES OF WILL ROGERS AND JESSE JAMES

Homer Croy, the novelist, died Monday evening in his home at 150 Pinehurst Avenue. His age was 82.

In 1926, Mr. Croy wrote "They Had To See Paris," which became Will Rogers' first talking picture. He was the biographer of Judge Isaac C. Parker, the famous hanging judge of the Old West, and one of the leading biographers of Jesse James.

"My parents were those old-fashioned people we used to hear so much about, but now are rarely ever mentioned—poor but honest," Mr. Croy once said. "I was born on a farm near Maryville, Mo., the year the Brooklyn Bridge was built.

"My parents came to Missouri in covered wagons. My father put the first plow into the prairie sod. I worked on our farm all my early life."

In "Country Cured," published in 1943, Mr. Croy told many of the details of that early life. Of this autobiography, a reviewer wrote:

"The author has traveled from Maryville to New York, Paris, and Hollywood, but the farm has always been his refuge and his substance. Like all farm boys, he portrays his early hatred of physical labor and love of good victuals."

Mr. Croy studied a vest-pocket dictionary as he rode a farm horse into Maryville. Soon he began writing articles for farm journals. Then he entered the University of Missouri, "where I became the first student in the first school of journalism in the world," he said.

He failed English in his senior year, but went to New York anyway, and took a job with the Butterick Publications, under Theodore Dreiser, who was then editing three women's magazines.

PRAISED BY CRITIC

The young writer turned out many magazine stories. "Now and then a good one, but for the most part they were about what you think," was how he put it. "Eventually I turned out a novel, and after a terrific struggle, got it published. They paid in postage stamps."

In 1914, Mr. Croy went on a trip around the world, sending back articles for American magazines. He also had a motion-picture camera with him, and an operator. The start of World War I in Europe, on August 4, 1914, found him in Calcutta.

Mr. Croy cabled the Universal Film Co. for money but was stranded for several weeks because of war conditions. Finally a friend, Mae Belle Savell, whom he had notified of his financial straits, managed to get a money order sent to him. He came home and, the next year, married Miss Savell.

Mr. Croy was known at first as a humorist. He was fond of giving himself titles like "Two-Gun Croy, the law north of 125th Street," and once said that the reason Mr. Dreiser had hired him originally was because he knew that Washington, Mo., was where they made corn cob pipes.

But when, in 1923, his novel "West of the Water Tower" achieved substantial success, it was called by a critic "a serious, realistic work which has something of the spirit of Hardy [Thomas Hardy] and Dreiser. But Croy's outlook is more hopeful. He sees life without illusion and yet accepts and approves it."

JESSE JAMES LEGENDS

Among the many other books Mr. Croy wrote was "Jesse James Was My Neighbor" (1949), in which he drew upon his intimate knowledge of the James legends gleaned as a cub reporter on the St. Joseph (Mo.) Gazette. In 1953 he wrote "Our Will Rogers," a full-length biography of the cowboy humorist.

Mr. Croy's novel, "Family Honeymoon," was dramatized as a stage play by Owen Davis, and later turned into a motion picture starring Fred MacMurray and Claudette Colbert.

Tall, gangling, bald, and mild mannered, "a gentleman from Missouri who wears a Windsor tie and has a twinkle in his calm eye," was as accurate a description of Mr. Croy as ever given.

Mr. Croy was for many years one of the bread-and-butter writers of the Saturday Evening Post.

He leaves his wife, Mae, and a daughter, Carol. A funeral service will be held at 1 p.m. Thursday at Frank E. Campbell's, Madison Avenue and 81st Street.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, yesterday President Johnson submitted to Congress a report, prepared by the Federal Council on Science and Technology, on the Federal water resources research program for the fiscal year 1966. The report is available to the public, upon request. It is a progress report of the committee, established by the Council, to review Federal agency activities in water research.

May 26, 1965

I ask unanimous consent that President Johnson's letter accompanying the report be printed in the RECORD.

The letter was addressed to the President of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 25, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Even before there was a United States, people of this land were using and developing its water resources. Over the years the nature of the problems has changed and the size and scope of the solutions has increased but our technology has kept abreast of the needs.

Today far greater demands are pressing upon both our water resources and the technology required to meet our varied water needs. Our streams and ground water resources must meet the needs of nearly 200 million people for food, fiber, and industrial processing. At the same time we have expected our streams to carry off the waste products of our homes, industries, and farms. We must also protect our people from damaging floods such as those which have recently occurred along the upper Mississippi River.

A projection of our population growth over the next few decades could lead to the conclusion that very serious water shortages might be expected over much of the Nation in the not far distant future. Pollution has already caused serious problems in many of our streams and lakes, and, with a growing population, pollution problems could extend to almost all of our water sources.

Such predictions must not come true. Our scientists and engineers will find solutions to meet these problems as they develop, if we maintain a continuing and effective research program. Earlier this year, I transmitted to you legislation expanding and extending one aspect of the water research program—desalting. Today I am pleased to transmit a report summarizing the Federal water resources research program for fiscal year 1966 prepared by the Committee on Water Resources Research of the Federal Council of Science and Technology.

The program is not large but it is vital. The total proposed expenditure for the 1966 fiscal year is only \$101 million, less than one percent of the total national expenditure on water supply, water control and waste treatment. But the Committee is at work on the preparation of a long range research program of incalculable importance to our future. I am asking the Chairman of the Federal Council to press forward on the development of this plan.

We must be sure that our research effort is adequate to guarantee sufficient water for all our future needs. On this there can be no compromise. We must, also, strive through research to find a better basis for minimizing the damaging effects of water and to preserve and protect the natural beauty of our streams and lakes for the health and enjoyment of all our people.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

HELICOPTER SERVICE BETWEEN SAN JOSE, PALO ALTO, AND SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on May 24, Trans World Airlines filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board an announcement of an agreement with San Francisco and Oakland Helicopter Airlines to enlarge services between the San Francisco Airport and Palo Alto and San Jose.

This marks a big step forward on the part of our large trunk carriers to become actively interested in partnership arrangements for the bettering of service between outlying communities of metropolitan areas and our terminal airports.

I consider this one of the most forward-looking actions taken by a trunk line in helping to develop VSTOL air services where badly needed to improve general airline service. By his action in joining with the helicopter company, President C. C. Tillinghast, Jr., will not only aid and expedite transportation to and from the major airport; he will also assist in developing an entire new concept in short-haul transportation by air.

Thus, instead of letting the helicopter service go down the drain, and thereby fail to make use of the experience already gained, TWA is moving to be a helpful partner to this presently struggling means of transport. I congratulate President Tillinghast and TWA on their forward-looking action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete announcement of this new aviation service.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO HELICOPTER LINE TO LINK TWA FLIGHTS WITH BAY AREA COMMU- NITIES

Scheduled helicopter service between San Jose and Palo Alto, Calif., and the Trans World Airlines passenger terminal at San Francisco International Airport will be inaugurated early this summer by San Francisco and Oakland Helicopter Airlines, Inc. (SFO).

Announcement of the proposed service, filed May 24 with the Civil Aeronautics Board, was made by TWA President Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., and M. F. Bagan, president of SFO.

The new service, upon CAB approval of the agreement and of SFO's application to serve the San Jose airport, will provide convenient direct connections to and from TWA domestic and international flights.

SFO will schedule a minimum of 10 round trips each weekday over the new route and 10 on weekends with twin-turbine 26-passenger Sikorsky S-61 equipment. The one-way fare to Palo Alto will be \$7.50; to San Jose, \$9.50.

Flight time to Palo Alto, about 20 miles by freeway from San Francisco International Airport, will be 8 minutes. The 35-mile trip to San Jose will be flown in 15 minutes.

Palo Alto and San Jose are southeast of the San Francisco Airport, in Santa Clara County, the fastest-growing region in the bay area, with a heavy concentration of electronics and defense industry activity.

In addition to the Santa Clara County operations, SFO will reschedule some of its existing East Bay scheduled helicopter and hovercraft services to TWA's terminal area to complement its service pattern. This new distribution of helicopter services within the San Francisco terminal complex will benefit travelers from Oakland, Berkeley, and points in Contra Costa and Marin counties with a broader choice of convenient connecting services.

Mr. Tillinghast said that "In the interests of fostering development of new and improved services for the traveling public, and at the same time contributing direct support to the helicopter industry where expansion into new markets is justified, TWA has agreed to guarantee SFO's break-even costs for the

new Peninsula operations to the extent that they are not covered by operating revenues."

"This partnership marks another forward step in the implementation of TWA's policy of assistance to helicopter operators during this crucial stage of their development," he said.

TWA flies about 900,000 passengers a year in and out of San Francisco International Airport on flights serving 69 other U.S. cities and direct polar route flights to and from Europe. Currently, TWA schedules an all-jet pattern of 25 daily arrivals and departures at San Francisco.

CBS REPORT SHOWS NEED FOR STRENGTHENED TRAFFIC-SAFE- TY EFFORT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the night before last 30 million Americans took a driver's test. It is to be hoped that the rest of the Nation did better than the 2,000 drivers in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Los Angeles whose test scores are known. Only 4 percent of the tested drivers in these four cities received scores in the "excellent" category. Forty-two percent failed.

We owe a real debt of gratitude to the Columbia Broadcasting System for bringing the traffic-safety problem into our homes. Monday night's "CBS News Report" will stand as a landmark in television news reporting and public service. I hope the CBS "National Drivers Test" will be repeated, on an annual basis, because it serves as a deadly reminder to all of us that there is room for a tremendous amount of improvement in the driving skills of the American people. The Shell Oil Co., in sponsoring this program, showed managerial courage and enlightenment that are too rare in our country today, for the show emphasized, not the zip and power and getaway of today's automobile and the amount of fuel it uses, but the awful consequences of the misuse of automobiles by individuals. And, of course, the work of the National Safety Council, which long has advocated improved driver-training programs, cannot be overlooked.

As we approach the Memorial Day weekend and the coming July 4 weekend, we should stop to consider a number of the aspects of the traffic-safety problems that were brought out by the CBS show.

The high failure rate should stimulate us to do something about better driver-education and training programs; but it should not lull us into a false sense of security, in the belief that the problem is really the "nut behind the wheel," and that if we can solve that aspect of it, we shall have dealt adequately with the traffic-safety situation. That simply is not the case.

Last April 5, the very able Federal Highway Administrator, Rex Whitton, told the Greater New York Safety Council:

We recognize that no single attack—to the exclusion of all others—can possibly solve the problem. We need a balanced program, giving attention to the driver, the vehicle, and the roadway, and to the interaction of these three elements.

May 26, 1965

America, the Citadel of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the excellent programs sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary is its Americanism program. A part of that program is an essay contest conducted in the schools of the State. The title selected this year was, "Americanism, the Citadel of Freedom." The winning essay for the 10, 11, and 12 grades was Miss Pam Widner, of Westby, Wis., and I submit for the consideration of the Members and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning essay by Pam Widner. I am proud of the excellent work of this young lady and also of the work of Bill Hasse, of Cazenovia, Wis., whose essay won second place. I hope this recognition will encourage a continuance of this activity by the American Legion Auxiliary and stimulate additional interest in the program among young Americans.

AMERICA, THE CITADEL OF FREEDOM
(By Pam Widner, Westby, Wis.)

What an emotional picture this phrase brings to the minds of Americans. Stirring sights and scenes of past and present America. The red, white, and blue "freedom" flag, the cracked Liberty Bell, Francis Scott Key composing during the heat of a battle while looking at "Old Glory."

A hot, stuffy room where several learned men bitterly discuss and argue over a document which begins "We, the people—." Later, more discussion and argument. This time the subject of attention is called a Bill of Rights. It has to do with the basic freedoms demanded by the States, and again the word. Wars. Men dying to preserve the freedoms they have established—men dying to preserve the country where these freedoms flourish. Development and growth of a nation. An expanding nation of men and women of high ideals and values.

We think too, of the thrill of cheering a gigantic missile as science endeavors to further the borders of freedom. The satisfied and grateful feeling when your contribution to medical research have conquered another enemy of society. The accomplishments and graves of great leaders who have devoted their lives to the preservation of American liberties.

These symbolic footnotes to history are familiar to us all. Not so many of us, however, consider and reflect the most important freedoms that we sometimes tend to disregard and take for granted. But what would happen if we could not go to church or Sunday morning; we could not have Easter and Christmas; if there would be no hope of being saved? Suppose the government regulated all transportation and checked all mail—even letters to your loved ones. Your daily newspaper and news magazines would all give the same views. Or perhaps your children were taken out of school after eighth grade or maybe high school—what about the college you had intended for them? How would you react to curtailing all political activities? No fundraising organizations, nor convention, nor election days.

It's a staggering thought, but many peoples of the world live—rather, exist without even knowledge of such things. A highly organized secrecy machine? No. More cor-

rectly a military control system—control of everything. And still such people are complacent. How can you be dissatisfied if you know of nothing better. Only an ugly memory of things much worse. Yet we complain, we criticize, we improve.

This system of freedom was not pro-pounded to be perfect. Very prevalent today is the Negro problem, the Appalachian problem, the query of foreign policy. But ours is fashioned from the greatest political ideas and successful government ideals of the centuries. It is a slow, complicated process; and intricate system, yet so much better than any other form of control it is hailed as the beginning of modern world democracy.

The American system puts the governing power in the hands of its people. They fought and died for the right to do so. They expanded and nourished its growth. They now continue to preserve and improve it. Americans, accept thankfully your responsibility to uphold and protect your America—citadel of your freedom.

they have no bank accounts; the fact that despoliation is a national crime against the people as well as against nature; the conviction that poverty is more than a city or a county or a State concern—that it is a social concern and therefore a problem for the general society.

Think back for a moment to the hours of past American Presidents, particularly to Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman and John F. Kennedy, and their urgings for programs geared to the people's needs where they live, and Johnson's urgings sound greatly similar.

All have in common a broad concern for the people and through the people for the national good. It would be pleasant to include Dwight D. Eisenhower among these but it would not be faithful: He had no less an affection for the people, but he differed sharply, in his attitudes, on means.

Unpleasant Necessity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, editorials recently appearing in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram and the Fort Worth Press concerning Presidential action in the Dominican Republic present commentaries well worth general reading.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the two editorials referred to:

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Press, May 8, 1965]

UNPLEASANT NECESSITY?

Sending U.S. forces to the neighboring Dominican Republic was an act of necessity. We may deplore the necessity, but we cannot deplore the action. President Johnson's prompt decision illustrated the courage of commonsense. The action had to be swift, or not at all.

There are signs that some members of the Organization of American States are unhappy with this action. But the United States merely did what the OAS could and should have done, had it been equipped. If the action had awaited time for the OAS to go through its usual mumbo-jumbo, it would have been too late.

The urgent issue was the rescue of Americans whose lives were in danger. That is a first duty of the American Government in any situation. Rescue of other nationals who wanted to leave, including even some Dominicans, could be nothing more than an act of mercy.

President Johnson says the disorder was being pushed by Communist elements.

The Western Hemisphere cannot tolerate any more Castros in its middle. Whatever is necessary to prevent a Communist takeover in any American country, big or little, ought to be undertaken in self-protection for the whole area, especially the countries of Central and South America.

The United States already has announced it is prepared to "transfer its responsibility to the OAS at the earliest possible moment."

The sooner our forces can leave the better Americans will like it. But we will not leave U.S. citizens, or other innocent victims, to the mercies of mob rule, whether inspired by local ruffians or more sinister elements.

Until then, the whole hemisphere should have but a single, prayerful hope: That some leaders in the Dominican Republic can estab-

Kudos for L.B.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, when going through a backlog of newspapers from my district recently, I was very pleased to come across an editorial from the April 27 issue of the Fresno Bee which so ably expresses my own admiration for the astuteness and abilities of President Lyndon B. Johnson that I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues and request permission to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

L.B.J. HAS HISTORY WORKING FOR HIM

President Lyndon B. Johnson has every right to look back upon the first months of the present Congress with more than a pinch of self-satisfaction. Up to now, it has been pretty much of a Johnson show.

He already has won a public aid to education program and has signed it into law. He is assured of Federal programs for hospital care for the aged, tied to social security. He will get an expanded war against poverty bill. Congress has made it clear, as well, it will give him a voting rights bill—the only question being when and in what form.

Moreover, Congress is sympathetic to his urgings for legislation to attack water pollution, to buy up park lands for the people, to beautify the countryside, to rewrite farm programs, to assault cancer and heart disease, to turn to that long overdue job of rewriting the Nation's immigration laws, to encourage the arts, to create a more realistic presidential succession statute. These and others.

The Johnson magic is working.

The President has certain things working for him which are indispensable to winning congressional support.

The most important, perhaps, is momentum.

Many of the programs for which Johnson is winning support are based on ideas expressed years ago and which are just now beginning to take hold. For instance: The concept that education is more than a local district concern, it is a national concern; the principle that none of the aged should go without medical attention simply because

May 26, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500120019-4 A26.5
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

cept and that the plane should be further developed as a valuable addition to our air strength.

The U.S. Army, General Electric Co., and the Ryan Aeronautical Co., have made an intensive investigation of the plane's integral systems and its performance data previous to April 27. The conversion from fans for vertical flights to jets for horizontal flight had been made by these planes more than 1,000 times. At the time of the April 27 failure, the pilot was checking the cockpit prior to converting the aircraft from conventional jet flight to the fan-powered mode used for vertical flight and hovering.

The plane involved had logged more than 36 hours of flight time requiring 45 conversions from fans to straight jets.

I share with the Ryan Co. and the family and friends of W. L. "Lou" Everett their sense of loss, and with the rest of the Nation deeply appreciate the contribution to the future of America's aircraft development that his career represented.

The Courts and Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more difficult every day to fight the battle against obscenity and pornography, and one of the principal reasons is the attitude of the courts. There was a time when we could have laws to protect the innocent. But in this modern age such laws, when enacted by the Congress and/or local legislative bodies, are struck down by the courts in their zeal to protect the "rights" of those who would corrupt our youth and our society for the sake of the almighty dollar.

One more example of this attitude on the part of the courts is outlined in the following editorial appearing in the Catholic Virginian recently, which discusses the recent ruling of a Richmond circuit court judge that Virginia's motion picture censorship law is unconstitutional:

[From the Catholic Virginian]

THE BEST CENSOR

A Richmond circuit court judge's ruling upsetting Virginia's motion picture censorship law apparently is going to make it next to impossible, for a time at least, to keep obscene movies off the screens of the State's theaters.

Judge John Wingo Knowles, following the ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court in a similar case involving Maryland's censorship law, ruled that Virginia's act is enforced unconstitutional. It places unconstitutional prior restraint on film distributors and does not give them speedy relief in the courts.

Neither court struck down censorship itself. In fact, the Supreme Court suggested Maryland might change its law to make it conform to the Constitution.

Virginia could and should do likewise. An effective censorship law is needed.

The Richmond Times-Dispatch, commenting editorially on Judge Knowles' ruling, said:

"Some persons say that regardless of the legal aspects, the censoring of movies should be abandoned in Virginia. Frankly, we, and many other Americans, are sick of the filth with which the public is being flooded today in books, stage plays and movies. Trying to stem the tide may be like trying to stop the flow of the Mississippi with a spoon. But maybe even a gesture in this direction serves a purpose in letting the pornography peddlers know that somebody is concerned about what they are doing to the minds and morals of Americans—and especially to young people."

The question of giving Virginia an effective censorship law in harmony with the Constitution addresses itself to the general assembly. Quite probably, the legislature will be asked to make such changes as are necessary at its 1966 session.

It would probably be the middle of 1966 before a new censorship law with teeth in it could become operative. In the interim, a lot of filth could be splashed on the screen in Virginia.

All of which points up the fact that the best censorship is the individual conscience rightly formed. The Legion of Decency provides closer screening, probably, than most censorship boards.

Unfortunately, some films are not submitted for review by the legion. Moviegoers, as a result, must be alert to the unrated films.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is very discouraging and I suppose the filth peddlers hope we will just give up. But the battle can be won, and it will be won, by an alert and aroused citizenry who will insist on adequate legal measures to solve this serious problem.

Martin Luther King on a Tightrope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear to many Americans that the great advocate of civil rights, Martin Luther King, is in fact a disciple of conflicting causes. While supposedly supporting increased freedom for his people at home, his public pronouncements continually echo the Communist line whose victory can end only in slavery for all Americans.

Some of us warned a long time ago that the agitator of violent demonstrations and the defiance of law and order possessed two faces. Now others are worried about where he may be leading his well-intentioned, but unsuspecting followers. There is every indication that one of King's chief supporters, the occupant of the White House, may be losing some of his admiration for the self-styled saviour.

The following column by Holmes Alexander from a recent issue of the Montgomery Advertiser points up some of the problems of the King-Johnson relationship:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DISPATCH

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Dr. Martin Luther King is somewhere in the revolving door between the vestibule of power and the great outdoors of White House disfavor.

There is persuasive information that President Johnson regards the voting rights bill as his last legislative obligation to the Negro revolutionaries whom Dr. King leads, and that the Nobel Peace Prize winner may find himself on the pavement for reasons assigned, such as:

Dr. King still stands under the thunderous indictment of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who called him a continental liar, and it's very difficult for anybody to be simultaneously registered in the good book of Mr. President and the bad book of Mr. Hoover.

Dr. King has publicly deprecated the President's war policy in Vietnam. L.B.J. is apt to be touchy on the point which the Negro leader makes; namely, that we can't afford to support both a war against communism and the war on poverty.

Finally, Dr. King has not fully renounced his shoot-from-the-hip plan for a leftwing boycott of southern industries and products.

Dr. King, in fact, begins to resemble Dr. Nemesis to the Johnson administration. He embodies just about all of the possible disasters which could befall the Great Society and tarnish its record in history, not to say his reelection chances. The catastrophes which the Democratic future watchers most fear are three in number.

No. 1 dread is that the protests against the ground fighting and the air bombardments in Vietnam will reach serious dimensions on the homefront. The President has smashed down most of the opposition he encountered in the Senate. He has been able to keep the big, powerful, pacifist newspapers from treating him the way they treated Barry Goldwater for taking the militant line against communism. But recent street demonstrations which President Johnson had a chance to witness from the White House windows clearly called for harshness against Alabama but softness toward communism in Asia. A marriage of minds, performed by the Reverend King, between the Negro radicals and the peacemongers could breed real trouble for the administration.

No. 2 dread is of domestic lawlessness. The proposed doubling of the District of Columbia police force (following a report which showed violent crime in April 1965 up 25 percent since April 1964) dramatizes the rise of the criminal classes during the Johnson Presidency. It is no longer altogether uncouth to note a connection between the crime rates and the Negro population. A State Governor, holding a Washington press conference, dropped a heavy remark about "nonviolent brickthrowers" with particular reference to some of Dr. King's followers. There is no doubt that Dr. King can give the administration the kind of long hot summer it hopes to avert.

Lastly, Dr. King's threatened boycott, although currently in abeyance, is a threat to the national prosperity in which the administration places so much reliance and pride. Mississippi, one of the Southern States on Dr. King's target chart, has just dispatched a trade mission to Europe with the blessings of the Commerce Department. There is a certain amount of breathholding here for fear that Dr. King's international reputation as a "peace" spokesman may cause trouble for the Mississippians who will be peddling Mississippi products in West Europe.

Right now it's hard to tell whether Dr. King is coming or going through the revolving door.

lish a stable, non-Communist government, capable of keeping order—and quickly.

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, May 5, 1965]

MONROE DOCTRINE REVIVED?

President Johnson may have revived the Monroe Doctrine in a new form in two addresses about the trouble in the Dominican Republic. He told a television audience that "the American nations cannot, must not, and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."

Later, he spoke at a Washington meeting of the Legislative Council of the AFL-CIO Building Trades Department and said that "we don't propose to sit here in our rocking chair on our folded hands and let the Communists set up any government in the Western Hemisphere."

When President James Monroe made his famous pronouncement he was warning European nations against attempting to extend their governmental systems in the Western Hemisphere. President Johnson was talking of communism, and he attempted to make it a hemispheric declaration. His success in that attempt will be judged by the support he receives from other American nations.

There is much more reason now than in the time of President Monroe for hemispheric participation in a warning, backed by force where necessary, against extending in this part of the world a system which by the public pronouncement of its leaders has a purpose of promoting revolution in non-Communist countries, with a view to eventual world domination.

A great hindrance to hemispheric cooperation in this matter is the just and proper opposition to any interference by one nation in the affairs of another. This opposition is right. The principle of noninterference is sound, and it ought to be observed. Sometimes, though, the attempts to observe it are self-defeating. They are self-defeating when they condemn as intervention, and sometimes prevent, an action to defend against intervention.

The United States has been showing more military muscle lately in some places where it ought to be shown. It still, however, has not taken the diplomatic offensive at some times when it should not be on the defensive against charges of intervention. Instead of defending its intervention in the Dominican Republic, the United States could have led off with intervention charges against Cuba and, directly or indirectly, against the Soviet Union and Peiping, China. If charges of intervention were placed where they belong and the evidence produced, there would be less reason for Latin American states to look with distrust upon an action by the United States to defend the hemisphere against intervention.

Somehow or other, if the American states hope to protect themselves against intervention, there has to be a way of doing something about it.

Colonel O'Meara and the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has quite properly become one of our greatest Federal

institutions and its important role in the daily lives of many millions of our men, women, and children is understood and appreciated by too few of our people.

One of the most efficiently operated Veterans' Administration regional offices in the United States is the Hartford, Conn., office which is under the direction of Col. Edward W. O'Meara with whom I have had the pleasure of working for many years. I was delighted to read in the May 18, 1965 edition of the New Britain, Conn., Herald, an article by another old friend, Arthur E. McEvoy, managing editor emeritus of the Herald, who in his capacity as "The Observer" brought home the fact that the Veterans' Administration today is the biggest business organization in the United States and detailed its broad and vital services.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the laudable performance of Colonel O'Meara and of the Hartford regional office in its dedication to the administration of an established program of humanitarianism, I attach herewith the text of Mr. McEvoy's column, "State VA Part of Largest Business Firm in United States":

THE OBSERVER: STATE VA PART OF LARGEST BUSINESS FIRM IN UNITED STATES

(By Arthur E. McEvoy)

Twenty years after V-E Day and the end of World War II the Veterans' Administration, through its Hartford office, is disbursing more than \$70 million annually in Connecticut to administer many programs for the benefit of men and women who were in the military service in two world wars and their dependent survivors.

In the new Federal Building in the capital city, around which the activities of the VA in Connecticut revolve, many functions affecting the lives of ex-GI's, their widows and children are carried out by the staff of Col. Edward W. O'Meara, regional manager.

SERVICES LISTED

These include compensation payments, pensions, educational allowances, grants to paraplegic veterans of \$10,000 toward building or buying a home and benefits to widows and minor children. The extent of the transactions may be visualized by the number of checks issued in April. In that month chacks went to 42,479 living veterans and 13,973 to widows, widows and children or children alone. Of the latter figure, 6,582 went to the World War I account and 6,401 to World War II beneficiaries.

In a display case in the main corridor of VA regional headquarters is a newspaper article saying "Today, the biggest business organization in the United States is not General Motors or A.T. & T. but the Veterans' Administration. Veterans and their immediate families comprise almost half the total U.S. population and the VA has some 22 million 'customers' in its active files."

UNIQUE SYSTEM

The Hartford office has records of 235,000 of the 350,000 veterans in Connecticut. In a forest of steel cabinets are their military history, data on medical examinations and treatments as well as two-way correspondence. A unique filing system installed as an experiment for possible use throughout the Nation enables members of the staff to find a folder enclosing any veteran's record with a minimum of time and effort.

Specialists fill many posts in the Hartford office. A tour discloses the desks of physicians, lawyers, construction experts, occupation experts, loan administration agents, insurance underwriters and accountants, a cross section of the professional fields. Other employees vital to the operation are Flexowriter operators, stenographers, distaphone

operators. In addition are many requiring special skills or understanding.

GOOD MORTGAGE RISKS

In the Loan Guarantee Division are approximately 95,000 mortgage loans which the office has guaranteed amounting to about \$1 billion. "Evidence of how our veterans have taken care of their mortgage obligations is indicated by the remarkably low loss ratio which is three-tenths of 1 percent," said Colonel O'Meara, adding, "This, I think anyone would say, is an extraordinary record."

Versatile machines speed the work and make possible swift handling of an enormous amount of business transacted. By means of a telecommunication system about 520 messages are sent out monthly and about 525 received. The office can and does speak with all VA installations in the country through a series of relays.

SUPERVISES ESTATES

The mail desk handles about 70,000 pieces of mail a month, 40,000 incoming and 30,000 outgoing. Of those received about 7,000 are processed by a mechanical locator index that looks to this writer like a small scale ferris wheel. A push of a button brings within reach of the operator's hand the addresses of many thousands of veterans in the State.

Many unanticipated problems are handled by the chief attorney's office which also exercises supervision over estates amounting to \$9 million of some 6,300 incompetent veterans as well as beneficiaries and minor children.

During the fiscal year 1964, \$72,500,000 was expended in Connecticut to carry out various functions of the regional Hartford office. This undertaking was accomplished by a staff of 118 whose working space and appurtenances occupy 30,500 square feet, the entire first floor of the Federal building.

Colonel O'Meara, who heads this big operation, is no stranger to New Britain. He was the first manager of the social security office in this city.

Biennial Awards Meeting of the Americans for Constitutional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, last evening in the city of Washington, D.C., the biennial awards meeting of the Americans for Constitutional Action was held. Present were the officers and trustees of this body dedicated to preservation of the Constitution of the United States, and their purpose was to award the biennial certificates to Congressmen of both Houses who, in their opinion, had supported legislative measures sustaining, strengthening, and defending the spirit and principles of the Constitution as defined by the Founding Fathers of our Republic.

Many fine words were spoken by Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman of the board of trustees, but I thought in these days when we are considering the reorganization of the Congress, that the words of the president of Americans for Constitutional Action, retired Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S. Army, were particularly apropos. They are:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored this evening to be associated with Admiral Moreell, Governor Edison, and other

A2668

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—APPENDIX

members of our board of trustees in representing Americans for Constitutional Action. We speak for the thousands of our members throughout the country who are here in spirit to honor our distinguished guests.

The deep and single-minded concern of Americans for Constitutional Action is the election of constitutional conservatives to Congress. We think that the Congress is the very heart of constitutional government. It is the basic branch in our Government of divided powers. Congress can pass laws over a Presidential veto, it can impeach a President or a Supreme Court Justice. The Constitution does prudently divide the powers of Government, but it places the ultimate responsibility upon the representatives of the people in the Congress.

Today, the Congress is challenged by the emergence of a new force in our national life, the political party. The political party bridges those divisions of the governmental power so carefully incorporated in our Constitution. Its interests are to unite the legislative, executive, and judicial powers in service to the party.

I do not suggest that the political party is an evil influence, but only that it is dangerous influence. It is natural and right that men and women of like mind should be associated in their political endeavors. It is essential, however, that all such associations be subordinated to the fundamental law and spirit of the Constitution. The evil grows when men place their allegiance to party above their allegiance to the Constitution.

Individual Members of Congress cannot alone withstand the pressures of our powerful executive branch. Only the Congress as a whole, conscious of its own responsibilities and aware of the encroachments of the executive and judicial branches, can act effectively to protect its Members from the executive power.

Congress is not an effective body today. It does not protect its Members from the executive retribution.

We honor tonight those Members of the 88th Congress who persevered in their dedication to the Constitution they were sworn to uphold. Like the Greeks at Thermopylae, they hold a redoubt which is vital to the survival of our country. We applaud their vision and courage and we summon all of our people to rally to the noble cause which they so ably serve.

The Great Society Is Not for Indians— Indians Ignored in Great Society Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in a column which appeared in the Gadsden Times of Gadsden, Ala., on May 23, Paul Harvey reminds us of the indifference of the social planners and the architects of the Great Society to the plight of the American Indians.

There is more than a little hypocrisy in the constant beating of the drums for the alleged injustices against Negroes while we complacently allow discrimination, denial of civil rights and abject poverty to exist for the Indians.

I include Mr. Harvey's column and commend it to you for careful study:

THE GREAT SOCIETY IS NOT FOR INDIANS

There's nothing "great" about the Great Society to the American Indian.

His poverty is unimproved and unnoticed. He is as discriminated against as ever. Nobody is speechmaking or demonstrating in behalf of the American Indian though his constitutional rights are contradicted, and, for many, the economic need is desperate.

Certainly there are enough Federal employees assigned to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We are supporting one bureaucrat for every 30 Indians.

Unemployment nationally is about 5 percent. Unemployment among reservation Indians is 49 percent.

The average American lives to be 62. The average Indian dies at 42.

A diet of cornmeal, flour, rice, beans, lard, and cheese make one paunchy, but not healthy.

A dozen sleeping in a one-room shack is the kind of deprivation we bleed over in Asia and ignore in our own midst.

The Constitution specifically guarantees the rights of "every person" * * *.

Yet tribal lands, property, and assets are administered by the Great White Father in Washington.

Further, in much the same manner which the American Negro has found repugnant and intolerable, the American Indian has been denied "equal" employment opportunities.

This stench gets stirred up every few years, but nothing comes of it because the Indian represents only 380,000 votes and many can't, won't, or don't vote anyway.

The American Association of Indian Affairs has urged President Johnson to make a personal inspection of impoverished Indian reservations as he personally inspected Appalachia.

The Association's President, Alden Stevens, specifically urged the President to witness the underprivileged Americans on any of a dozen reservations.

The Sioux at Devils Lake, North Dakota. Or Rocky Mountain Reservation, Montana. Or the Shoshone-Bancock Reservation, Fort Hall, Idaho.

You will hear much from the Department of Interior about the "mutual help housing program" for Indians. But the larger issues of discrimination in employment, widespread deprivation and second-class citizenship which characterizes their minority society goes unchallenged and unchanged.

President Johnson has acknowledged that "our Indian people suffer more from poverty today than any other group in America." *

So, since "everybody" recognizes the injustice and the need, the conclusion is inescapable:

Our much-vaunted compassion for the rights of minorities is nine parts hypocrisy as long as we continue to exclude this minority from our Great Society. Five hundred years is patience enough.

Now you know why the Indian says "Ugh."

Cross-Florida Barge Canal—Boom to Defense, Economy, Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on July 23, 1942, legislation authorizing the construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal was approved, based on a sound recommendation by the Corps of Engineers. The Engineers testified to the

House Committee on Rivers and Harbors:

The value of the barge canal in time of war, together with the prospective benefits to be anticipated in normal times, is sufficient to warrant its construction.

A decade later, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in a memorandum to President Truman, said that the project "will provide an additional and shorter line of communication between the gulf coast and the east coast and would thus reduce exposure of shipping to submarine attack."

Just 10 years after that statement, Chairman Carl Vinson of the powerful House Armed Services Committee, wrote:

The proposed Cross-Florida Barge Canal has great defense potentialities.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell the House that the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is now being constructed and funds have been approved by the Congress for the initial construction, which is proceeding at both ends of the 107-mile canal near the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico.

The Corps of Engineers have reported that the canal is economically justified, and this justification is improving with the discovery and development of a large phosphate mining area in north-central Florida. The canal will not only be of prime importance to the national defense of our country, especially in these critical times in the Caribbean, but it will help the economic development of the whole country.

Incidental to the defense and economic factors, the Cross-Florida Barge Canal will also open up large new recreation areas, as pointed out by the following article from the Florida Times-Union, written by Russ Oleson:

[From the Florida Times-Union, May 19, 1965]

CHECKING WITH THE PRESS BOX

(By Russ Oleson)

Pleasure boaters in northeast Florida are going to have whole new avenues of thought and activity once the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is opened to traffic.

Along with the construction of the 185-mile waterway from Jacksonville to Yankeetown will be the development of multiple recreation and conservation areas.

From deep water in the St. Johns River near Palatka to deep water in the Gulf of Mexico near Yankeetown is a distance of 107 miles. Corps of Engineers officials said the canal will be 12 feet deep the majority of the distance with a bottom width of 150 feet.

In a description of what is being planned the canal authority of Florida has given us a preview of what is to come with "long-range and almost unlimited boating possibilities foremost and probably the easiest to foresee at this stage of canal development.

"Literally hundreds of pleasure craft will be able to cross from one coast of Florida to the other on the same day, collectively or individually, and travel a protected waterway. This activity alone will cause, through necessity and demand, the construction of off-canal marinas and overnight facilities. For both pleasure and commercial craft this cross-Florida route would be a saving of 611 miles by the Florida Keys and 356 miles via Okeechobee waterways."

Local clubs have voiced an interest in cruising the canal once it opens.

T. T. Cox, commodore of the Jacksonville Outboard Club, said his group has discussed the possibility of cruising the waterway but

origin quota system" and substitute priorities based on needed skills and relationship to U.S. citizens and resident aliens? Yes, 68.4 percent; no, 27.6 percent; no answer, 4.0 percent.

3. Vietnam—Do you favor:

(a) The present U.S. program of stepped-up military and financial assistance? Yes, 48.5 percent; no, 28.7 percent; no answer, 22.8 percent.

(b) An intensified military effort using troops and assistance from other free south-east Asian nations in cooperation with U.S. forces? Yes, 62.7 percent; no, 21.1 percent; no answer, 16.2 percent.

(c) A negotiated settlement for withdrawal of U.S. troops and assistance and establishment of a neutralist government? Yes, 33.7 percent; no, 46.2 percent; no answer, 20.1 percent.

4. Do you favor continued U.S. aid to Indonesia and the United Arab Republic? Yes, 7.6 percent; no, 86.2 percent; no answer, 6.2 percent.

5. Do you favor U.S. trade with Communist bloc nations of:

(a) Food, such as the 1964 wheat sales? Percent yes, 50.1; percent no, 46.4; percent no answer, 3.5.

(b) Industrial and consumer goods? Percent yes, 31.7; percent no, 61.8; percent no answer, 6.5.

6. A bill providing additional Federal assistance for health care for the aged will undoubtedly pass Congress this year.¹ Of the major proposals under consideration, do you favor:

(a) "Medicare"—administration's King-Anderson bill financed by social security taxes? Percent yes, 22.9; percent no, 59.3; percent no answer, 17.8.

(b) "ElderCare"—Herlong-Curtis (American Medical Association) bill? Percent yes, 46.9; percent no, 32.2; percent no answer, 20.9.

(c) "Bow bill"—provides tax deductions and tax credits for purchase of private health insurance? Percent yes, 47.8; percent no, 28.3; percent no answer, 23.9.

7. Do you favor President Johnson's proposal for Federal rent subsidies to low income families in lieu of additional public housing? Percent yes, 25.3; percent no, 66.7; percent no answer, 8.

8. Many education bills are pending in Congress.² Do you favor:

(a) Administration proposal for preschool training of youngsters in urban and rural slum areas? Percent yes, 49.2; percent no, 41.7; percent no answer, 9.1.

(b) Administration proposal of \$1 billion of aid to elementary and secondary schools allocated by the number of students whose family incomes are under \$2,000? Percent yes, 45.6; percent no, 43; percent no answer, 11.4.

(c) Administration proposal for Federal aid to private schools? Percent yes, 21.2; percent no, 67.1; percent no answer, 11.7.

(d) Administration proposal of \$70 million for Federal scholarship grants to 140,000 needy first year college students? Percent yes, 52; percent no, 28.1; percent no answer, 9.9.

(e) Return of 2 percent of Federal income tax collections from each State to that State, earmarked for education but without Federal involvement? Percent yes, 69.7; percent no, 20.5; percent no answer, 9.8.

(f) Ayres' bill providing each family a tax credit of up to \$100 per year for the amount

¹H.R. 6675, which passed the House on April 8, incorporated mainly the features of (b) above.

²Note.—H.R. 2362, which passed the House on March 26, included features (a), (b), and (c) above. An average of the responses to these three parts is as follows: Percent yes, 38.7; percent no, 50.6; percent no answer, 10.7.

of State and local school taxes or a tax credit of \$50 per year for each child in school up to a maximum of \$200? Percent yes, 61.8; percent no, 25.4; percent no answer, 12.8.

(g) Permitting tax deductions and/or tax credits for partial costs of college education expenses? Percent yes, 80.6; percent no, 14; percent no answer, 5.4.

9. Do you favor repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which now permits States to enact "Right to Work" laws? Percent yes, 19.2; percent no, 69.6; percent no answer, 11.2.

10. Do you favor Federal legislation to tighten control of the sale and purchase of firearms? Percent yes, 68.4; percent no, 29.9; percent no answer, 1.7.

11. Do you favor the proposed change in length of term from 2 years to 4 years for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives? Percent yes, 61.7; percent no, 34.4; percent no answer, 3.9.

Draft Statement on Bill To Increase Lump-Sum Payment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker on May 25, 1965, I introduced H.R. 8442 which provides for an increase in the maximum lump-sum death payment under social security from \$255 to \$312 immediately and to \$368 after 1971. The present lump-sum death payment was established by Congress in 1952 and it is apparent that since that time the consumer price index has risen; the cost of funerals has skyrocketed, having risen at least 30 percent; and hospital and medical costs of the last illness has risen approximately 50 percent—all without a corresponding increase in social security death benefits.

My bill, H.R. 8442, incorporates the proposals of the 1965 Advisory Council on Social Security which strongly urged a revision in the maximum lump-sum death payment. The Council specifically recommended that the amount of the payment be changed from the present maximum amount of \$255 to the highest family maximum monthly benefit. In other words, under this proposal the maximum death payment would increase whenever the maximum monthly family benefit is increased. At the present time this would mean an increase of the death payment from \$255 to \$312 and after 1971, when the statutory ceiling for maximum monthly benefits rises, from \$312 to \$368.

This revision would benefit more than 600,000 families including millions of dependents who face the tragedy of the death of the family breadwinner with insufficient financial resources. While benefiting many, the cost of implementing this legislation would be minimal.

We cannot become complacent with what has gone before but rather we must recognize and deal with, each year, the problems concerning social security which were not envisioned by those who drafted the original Social Security Act.

The social security program has been a successful investment for millions of Americans, and its continuing expansion and improvement can be a source of pride for Congress and for every American.

On March 26, 1965, I introduced H.R. 6843 to provide benefits to widows who remarry after age 62 but who under the present social security law forfeit benefits because of their remarriage. I stated at that time that this was but one of many inequities of our present law, inequities which should be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

The proposed increase in the lump-sum death payment is another example of an inequity which has resulted from the lapse of 13 years without an amendment to a section of the Social Security Act which applies to more than 1 million families each year.

I urge my colleagues to give this proposal careful consideration and continue the record of success in working toward an efficient, comprehensive social security system.

Report on Latin America

DR
SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the fact that State Department reports on both the policy and details of the situation in the Dominican Republic might lack complete factualness.

Therefore, I insert into the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks an article which appeared in the Sunday, May 23, Chicago Tribune by Columnist Jules Dubois and a report in yesterday's Washington Daily News by Reporter Hal Hendrix, both of which are on-the-spot reports from professional, competent, and respected journalists:

REPORT FROM LATIN AMERICA: U.S. MEDDLING IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC SEEN AS AID TO REDS

(By Jules Dubois)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, May 22.—Exposure to the political meddling by the White House and the State Department in the Dominican civil war has made it easier for this reporter to understand the instability that has afflicted governments in Saigon for so long.

American diplomacy here has created more and more resentment and made enemies of sincere friends of the United States as Washington contributed to the political turbulence and instability in the midst of what was to have been a final and decisive offensive against the Communists.

Every time the anti-Communist, pro-American forces have had the Reds on the ropes, the United States, wittingly or unwittingly, salvaged the Communists.

The fiction that the overwhelming majority of the people want the 1963 constitution restored is belied by the fact that the rest of the country, where more than 2,500,000 citizens reside, has produced no uprisings in favor of the revolution.

Because former President Juan Bosch and his Communist allies effectively smeared

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2683

parts of the free world remain threatened as long as the Communists maintain their imperial policy and their aggressive designs aimed at world control. The legitimate nationalism of the people of Georgia and other captive lands under communism represent the true weakness in the Red apparatus.

Let us encourage leaders of the Georgian people to continue to work for the restoration of freedom of their people, realizing as they do that as freedom is restored to their land, it will undoubtedly be restored to their neighboring states in Eastern Europe which share their present confinement in the Soviet colonial empire.

Excise Tax Repeal Long Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us in the Congress who have been seeking the elimination of the wartime nuisance excise taxes for the past several years are heartened indeed over the President's recent message and recommendations to the Congress since the repeal of these taxes is long overdue.

As Members of this House can well recall, these taxes were originally imposed during the war on toilet articles, cosmetics, jewelry, furs and leather goods, admissions, gasoline, autos, liquor, tobacco, telephone service, air passenger travel, and other miscellaneous articles to secure revenue for the conduct of the war. These war tax levies should have been eliminated as soon as the war ended, and the fact that they have continued to exist to this day, some 20 years after the war, is a sad breach of faith with the American people.

When these taxes are finally repealed, they should go into effect immediately. There should be a minimal gap between enactment and the effective date of the repeal so that prospective buyers will not postpone their purchases. This is little to ask for the American people who assumed these tax burdens willingly, but have deserved better in getting them lifted from their backs over the years.

President Johnson is to be complimented for moving to get rid of these completely indefensible levies, and I now urge the House to repeal these taxes immediately so that consumers can get the benefit of tax reduction on these items right away, and industry will not be harmed in any way by delayed consumer purchases pending the effective repeal date.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. Congress must remember that fact. At the same time, Congress and the people must recognize that the abuse of the power to spend at every level can bring ruin to free democratic government. This is just as true of local and State governments as it is of the Federal Government.

Obviously, we must spend what needs to be spent to provide essential services, but no government should be expected in this modern age, under ordinary conditions, to practice frugality or miserliness at the expense of the people, particularly the sick and handicapped.

Rigid economy is one thing; sheer penury is quite another thing. This is a dynamic, fast-growing country and our economy and social organism must be kept on the move; our standards upheld, protected, and improved.

Let me reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that the repeal of these onerous taxes should be put into effect immediately. This repeal is long overdue, and I am very happy to see these burdens lifted from American business and the American people. It is better late than never, but the sad fact remains that Congress should have repealed these wartime nuisance excisions long ago.

I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks editorials on the telephone excise tax which appeared in the Webster Times and Milford Daily News, highly esteemed newspapers published in my district.

The material follows:

[From the Webster (Mass.) Times, May 6, 1965]

HOW MUCH LONGER?

The Federal excise tax on telephone service—dating back to World War I—burdens subscribers to a greater degree than is generally realized.

The tax constitutes a 10-percent impost on local and long distance service. Developed to help raise war funds and to discourage nonessential calls on crowded telephone networks, the tax was repealed in 1924.

In 1932 Congress again imposed an excise tax on long distance service to help pay for public works projects during the depression. In 1941 the tax was placed on local service for the first time. This was to be temporary.

In today's complex society, communications services rank as an absolute necessity. Yet, telephone subscribers continue to pay a "temporary" tax. To reduce statistics to local level, Webster-Dudley subscribers paid \$81,953.04 in excise taxes in 1964. Oxford contributions came to \$27,094.44.

There is small doubt that the Federal excise tax on telephone service ought to be repealed. In fact, it should have been repealed a long time ago.

[From the Milford (Mass.) Daily News, Apr. 30, 1965]

'NUISANCE' TAXES

Treasury Secretary Dillon has announced that the administration is seeking the elimination of excise taxes on toilet articles, cosmetics, jewelry, furs, and leather goods during the present session of Congress.

But among the excise taxes which would be left standing are those on admissions, gasoline, autos, liquor, tobacco, telephone service, and air passenger travel.

It will be difficult to make a case for continuing the taxes on the last two items. Established as a wartime "emergency," with a deterrent effect in mind, the emergency no longer exists.

In these days of speed and narrowing boundaries telephone service has become a necessity, not a luxury. And in the efforts of both the Government and the individual States to advertise the Nation's vacation wonderlands air travel is a big factor.

Taxes on essential services like these tend to discourage their use and to hold back their further expansion.

National Issues Poll for 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as in past years, I am inserting in the RECORD the results of the annual national issues poll for the 13th District of Illinois. This 1965 questionnaire was circulated to postal patrons in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois. To date, more than 27,000 people have responded to the 1965 questionnaire, a higher response than in previous years.

In my letter to constituents enclosing a tabulation of the poll, I made the following comments which indicate my conviction that the questionnaire is a most helpful device in the continuing effort to make representative government work properly:

The response to the 1965 national issues poll has been excellent. To date more than 27,000 returns have been received—compared with 19,000 returns in 1963 and 24,000 in 1964—and completed questionnaires are still being received every day. I am grateful for your willingness to participate and for the deep interest it demonstrates in the affairs of our country. While it is not possible to acknowledge individually all comments made on the completed questionnaires, I want you to know that I have read them with great interest.

According to the latest census figures, the 13th district ranks first in the Nation in family income, first in least unemployment, and tied for first in the number of years of residents' education. The unique nature of the district, coupled with your keen and knowledgeable interest in national issues, makes the results of this national issues poll, as shown on the reverse side of this letter, most interesting.

For representative government to work effectively, there must be a continuous two-way flow of information between Washington, D.C. and the district. Toward this end, the poll is well worth the time, effort, and cost if it is informative, stimulates discussion and thought, points out topics where a lack of information exists, and encourages comment and communication from residents of our 13th district. Certainly, the response this year indicates that the poll has served its purpose.

Thank you again for your time and effort in considering and responding to these important national questions. I look forward to hearing from you in the future on matters of mutual concern, and assure you that your letters will always be welcome and your views thoughtfully considered. By calling on me in my capacity as your link between Illinois and the Federal Government in Washington, D.C., you will assist me in providing the type of representation that our district desires and deserves.

The results follow:

RESULTS OF 1965 NATIONAL ISSUES POLL

1. Civil rights—Do you favor legislation:

(a) To permit Federal registrars to register citizens denied the right to vote because of their race? Yes, 67.8 percent; no, 29.1 percent; no answer, 3.1 percent.

(b) To make the Civil Rights Commission permanent? Yes, 42.2 percent; no, 47.9 percent; no answer, 9.9 percent.

2. Do you favor revision of immigration laws to gradually eliminate the "national

A2686

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 26, 1965

the face, the burning of U.S. libraries, or the defacing of U.S. property. We are a patient nation; we are willing to help and nurture economies in developing areas of the world. Our efforts through annual foreign aid, through Public Law 480, the food-for-peace programs, through Peace Corps volunteers, and through the education of exchange students from other nations in our own universities and graduate schools, is eloquent proof of our willingness and earnest desire to help. But our help is given in dignity. We expect it to be received with dignity.

The very first section of the proposed Foreign Assistance Act before us today specifically provides:

It is the sense of the Congress that assistance under this or any other act to any foreign country which hereafter permits, or fails to take adequate measures to prevent, the damage or destruction by mob action of U.S. property within such country should be terminated and should not be resumed until the President determines that appropriate measures have been taken by such country to prevent a recurrence thereof.

Mr. Speaker, this provision is not intended as window dressing. This is a step in the right direction. I trust this section will be given full enforcement and not mere lip-service.

We in America provide the courtesy of protection for all foreign embassies and legations. We are requesting only that the same courtesy be given us by providing inviolate protection of our embassies abroad.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, our Government should help write and enforce an international convention which obligates all nations to protect the premises of embassies and legations against intrusion or damage.

In 1961, a United Nations conference of 81 states drafted the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, article 22 (2) of which provides:

The receiving or host state is under a special duty to take all the appropriate steps to protect the premises of the mission against any intrusion or damage and to prevent any disturbance of the peace of the mission or impairment of its dignity.

This convention has been ratified by more than 35 countries, but not by the United States, despite the fact that President Kennedy submitted it to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification on May 14, 1963. It has been forgotten and unpursued since then. Despite the recent attacks on U.S. embassies and the importance of this question of embassy protection to our people, this convention has not been given any consideration by the Congress. It has not been debated in the Senate or even given hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It is high time, Mr. Speaker, for our Government to take action on this question. Do we support this convention or not? Unilateral action affecting only those countries receiving U.S. foreign aid is not enough. We must work with other governments to obtain adherence to these international standards of behavior regarding embassy protection. There are many countries which do not receive U.S. foreign aid but from which we expect protection for our embassies.

The U.S.S.R. and many other Eastern European countries are good examples. Let us go on record by ratification of this convention as a nation which favors the inviolate protection of all foreign embassies and legations from unruly mob attack.

The provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 is a good step in the right direction. Let us recognize it as a unilateral beginning toward a multilateral and international rule of law.

Repeal of 14(b)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, one of the most controversial issues this Congress will have to deal with is the proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

California Members are not faced with a difficult decision on 14(b), however, since the people of our State have spoken loud and clear on the subject. In 1958 a State constitutional amendment to activate 14(b) was a major issue in California, promoted by former Senator Knowland in his bid for the governorship. The people rejected the proposal by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

However, despite a clear mandate from the California electorate, one still must come to grips with the apparent paradox of a closed shop in an open society.

The distinguished news commentator, Edward P. Morgan, presented on his May 19 ABC broadcast what to me was a telling analysis of this paradox, and I am pleased to include it in my comments for the benefit of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

Mr. Morgan's remarks follow:

The idea that a person has to join a labor union in order to hold a job has always given me a very uncomfortable feeling. It contains what seems to be a fundamental contradiction: a compulsory sacrifice of individual freedom in order to gain ends that are essential to the mass. The very term "closed shop" sounds antithetical to the open society, destructive of the freedom of choice with the argument that sometimes dictatorial methods are necessary to achieve the opportunities to which all in a democracy are entitled.

The sad fact is, however, that we have not yet reached the millennium, that the competitive pressures of life bring out or develop a certain amount of cussedness in human nature, that in the complexities of modern industrial society—with all its material bounty—the individual cannot always successfully fend for himself and he has to identify with some group in self-protection. If man were a paragon there would be little need for manufacturers' associations or labor unions or, for that matter, police departments. Given the reality that man is still some reach below the angels, the trick is to try to strike some kind of equitable balance between the pressures generated by competing groups of society. The 18th century British political philosopher, Jeremy Bentham, reasoned that the most virtuous social objective was the "greatest good for the greatest number." Bentham once wrote,

rather flamboyantly, "the sacred truth that the greatest happiness of the greatest number is the foundation of morals and legislation."

Herein, in large part at least, lies the justification for workers to band together to bargain for wages and working conditions with employers who otherwise—to put it mildly in the harsh light of the history of human exploitation—might not have a conscience lively enough to volunteer a fairer distribution of the wealth.

This, then, is a rather ragged thumbnail background to what may become the most rambunctious political struggle of the year—over section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which President Johnson in his labor message yesterday gently asked Congress to repeal. Although the Federal law recognizes the right of employers and unions to reach agreements requiring all workers to be union members, section 14(b) provides a curiously inconsistent loophole which allows individual States to ban such agreements.

Nineteen States now have these bans on the books. There were 20 but Indiana recently repealed its so-called right-to-work law. The slogan "right to work" is a monumental misnomer, though whoever thought it up gave the opponents of organized labor a multimillion dollar propaganda line which at once implicitly glorified the proud American legend of rugged individualism and depicted unions, not ruthless employers, as evil conspirators robbing the worker of his rights in their reach for power. The hard fact is that none of this legislation guarantees anybody the right work. Such laws, plainly and simply, are instruments to weaken unions or prevent their growth. This is not to say that some unions have not had too much power or have not misused it. But the further fact is that too often right-to-work laws are a cover for continued exploitation of cheap labor.

The National Labor Relations Board has a wealth of fresh testimony of the systematic intimidation of milihands in the Carolinas responding to efforts of the Textile Workers Union to organize them. Representatives of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers who tried to distribute handbills to employees of an electric lighting equipment plant in Magee, Miss., were threatened by mobs, vilified by local newspapers, and finally run out of town with the cooperation of police—who provided no other protection but an escort for their exit. Even so, the IBEW only lost a plant election by 15 votes. All three of these States where substandard wages are prevalent have right-to-work laws to help attract new industry.

These examples are only two of a legion of similar instances. Still this whole boodle of evidence is not enough, alone, to justify repeal of 14(b). The labor movement's most valid argument for a change in Taft-Hartley is increased union responsibility. Is a union totally committed to the welfare of its workers or is its leadership preoccupied in power plays? The recently revealed voting scandals which dislodged James Carey from the presidency of the International Union of Electrical Workers and the irregularities in the Steelworkers Union elections are unfortunate proof that organized labor is plagued with human weaknesses, too. Similar proof is the intolerable footdragging by locals of many unions on ending practices of racial discrimination.

There is no doubt that a certain sacrifice of an individual worker's freedom is involved in a union or a closed-shop contract. This sacrifice is justified if the greater good for the greater number is achieved. This is the very essence of free trade unionism and if American labor, with some humility, demonstrably repudges itself to this goal it can and will and should win the argument for repeal of 14(b).

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2685

Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin Y Wessin, the United States tried to dump the military man who has been, and who is, the symbol of anti-Communist resistance.

MOVE LAUNCHED TO DUMP HIM

Because Bosch and his Communist allies began to smear Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert-Barrera, president of the government of national reconstruction—whose formation we encouraged—the United States launched moves to dump him.

The United States tried to replace Imbert with an all-civilian junta handpicked by Bosch. As Wessin said the previous week, the United States was about to hand victory here and throughout Latin America to the Communists on a golden platter.

As one bewildered Latin American Ambassador (whose country has been on our side) said to me: "I cannot understand the thinking of the policymakers in the State Department and much less in the White House, which has been most active in this latest maneuver, in trying to dump Imbert. What does the United States expect to gain from that?"

The Ambassador, who said he has been reporting since 1962 to his government about Bosch's anti-Americanism and his alliance with the Communists, issued a warning. He said that if the White House and the State Department fail to untie the hands of the Imbert Government, American troops will have to finish the fight against the Communists.

Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, Jr., commander of American land forces here, said earlier that part of his mission was to prevent a Communist takeover and establishment of a government inimical to the interests of the United States.

COULD NOT HAVE DONE MORE TO RILE REGIME

The team sent here by the White House by President Johnson could not have done more to antagonize the pro-American, anti-Communist Imbert regime.

The loyal Dominican navy and air force, whose support was needed by the anti-Communist infantry, were prevented by the United States from taking action because of a cease fire that had long ago become a ceaseless fire.

Because one pilot may have goofed and his machinegun shell fall onto U.S. positions from which 5,000 troops fired back at him and shot him down, an entire air force was penalized by the U.S. Government. The Imbert Government was deprived of two-thirds of its firepower by order of the United States.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 25, 1965]

UNITED STATES FLOUNDERS INTO STRANGE KETTLE OF FISH
(By Hal Hendrix)

SANTO DOMINGO, May 25.—Washington's mishandling of the Dominican fiasco seems likely to go down in history as second only to the floundering which permitted Cuba to fall under Communist control.

While the Johnson administration is sending high-powered talent here, it appears to be moving toward only a temporary solution, at best.

The administration also seems to have discarded most of its collection of civilian and military intelligence data to satisfy politicians at home.

In attempting to pressure a political solution to the month-old conflict the validity of Washington's original assessment of the situation has become much obscured.

More than 21,000 marines and paratroopers were landed here. Their mission, as announced by President Johnson, was to protect American lives and property, and prevent the Dominican Republic from being taken over by the Communists.

That mission has not changed.

But diplomats and politicians now contend that the rebel movement they earlier said was dominated by Communist and other leftist extremists is not controlled by these elements.

On the scene, it has become obvious the switch in the Washington line was made to justify negotiations with questionable personalities within the rebel movement and others close to it.

CORNERED

With combat between rebel forces and troops loyal to the U.S.-created junta now blocked by existence of the American-controlled corridor, the rebel faction is cornered in a small downtown area.

Reports that the rebels enjoy widespread popular support throughout the island simply are not true.

The United States is obviously catering now to the rebel leaders who boasted about distributing weapons to thousands of civilians, including known Communists, pro-Castroites and ordinary hoodlums, at the outbreak of the rebellion.

This "arms for the people" action has resulted in the deaths of hundreds of Dominicans and the wounding of thousands of others. It has also led to the killing of 19 U.S. servicemen and the wounding of 115 more by gunfire from within the rebel zone.

These "constitutionalists" have been charged with more than 1,000 cease-fire violations—provocative shootings into the American-occupied area.

Official sources say Washington has intelligence reports detailing the extent of Communist and Castroite penetration of the rebel movement.

McGeorge Bundy, President Johnson's top troubleshooter here now, says he does not believe Communists now dominate the movement, headed by Col. Francisco Caamaño Deno.

IN BACKGROUND

In fact, Dominican Communists are content to remain in the background at the moment. Well-known Dominican Reds and militant members of the pro-Castro June 14 movement avoid rebel press conferences and generally stay out of sight of newsmen.

But the June 14 Movement has infiltrated deeply into the rebel group and its parent Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD). It is in full operation inside the rebel zone, with a new headquarters. It was outlawed before the rebellion began.

As a supporter of Colonel Caamaño's "constitutional" government, the June 14 movement said in the May 15 issue of its newspaper that "the only path to consolidate a democratic solution is to spread the armed struggle through the country."

The newspaper, parroting the movement's alliance with Castro's Cuba, said the "Dominican imperialists and reactionaries only have the support of the Yankee invaders."

The rebels and their allies have made it known they would welcome a settlement under which Antonio Guzman, Minister of Agriculture under the Juan Bosch government, would become president of a coalition proposed by the United States last week.

Senor Bosch is reported to have suggested Senor Guzman in meetings with U.S. officials in San Juan.

A big question among traditionally anti-Communist and pro-American Dominicans now is why the United States attempts to ram Senor Guzman into the provisional Presidency when it was obvious in advance he would be unacceptable to the anti-Bosch and anti-Communist elements, but pleasing to the rebels.

American manipulators argue that Senior Bosch won the Presidency with about 60 percent of the vote in 1962. But they don't discuss how much of this vote was actually against his opponents. At least 40 percent of the voters still are strongly anti-Bosch.

There is doubt here that Mr. Bundy and others involved in settlement negotiations are fully aware of the backgrounds of some of the constitutionalists and PRD figures they are dealing with.

Washington officials, including Mr. Bundy, contend they are distressed by the lack of capable politicians on the Dominican scene.

There are such capable Dominicans as Dr. Eduardo Read Harreras, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and now Ambassador to Rome, and former President Emilio de los Santos. Both have unsullied reputations and are not vulnerable to attack from either side.

It is also puzzling to many observers why the United States is using such emissaries as Dr. Jaime Benitez, chancellor of the University of Puerto Rico, who is well known in this area for his anti-Americanism. He is here now at Mr. Bundy's request.

Disturbing too is the manner in which U.S. diplomats persuaded Gen. Antonio Imbert Barrera and his four associates in the junta to accept the temporary government role, and then attempted to dump them—in an apparent concession to the rebels and the PRD leaders in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, the above reports on the Dominican situation will, I am for sure, arouse the interest of at least a few Members.

Foreign Aid and Protection of U.S.
Embassies Abroad

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, last December 9 I informed President Johnson of my grave concern with the unwarranted attacks by unruly mobs upon U.S. Embassies and legations abroad.

I asked the President, as a first step, "to articulate now on behalf of the American people our Nation's extreme disgust and displeasure with such practices, and also our view that each nation is responsible for controlling and curbing such outbursts which result in violence and destruction against the property of foreign embassies."

On February 10, 1965, the President finally did speak out on this matter. The White House statement was provoked by a 1-hour attack on the U.S. Embassy in Moscow by 2,000 unruly demonstrators.

This statement had a good effect. Recent demonstrations in front of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow by contrast have been well controlled by Moscow police. There has not been further destruction or desecration of U.S. property in that city.

As we consider this week the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, I am indeed pleased to find that the bill contains requirements for U.S. Embassy protection.

Embassy protection would now be established in the law as a precondition for the continuation of foreign aid. I strongly favor inclusion of such a provision.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we stopped our humanitarian assistance to nations whose only response has been a slap in